

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1891.

I.

THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE PROGRESSIVE.*

BY PROF. J. C. BOWMAN, A.M.

THE regnant principle of modern thought is that which finds expression in the one word, Evolution.

It is claimed for it that, more than all other words, it has served as a revolutionary call to modern thought, and that no system of thought can long sustain itself without adjusting itself to the new doctrine. The rapid progress made by this new mode of thinking within recent years is viewed with grave apprehension by many conservatives who believe that any favorable recognition of the principle of evolution carries with it a tendency to undermine the orthodox faith. But those of us who have been schooled in a system of thought whose distinctive feature is that of the Organic Idea and Organic Unity, have experienced no alarm at the progress of evolution, nor do we

* An address delivered May 12th, 1891, in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., by Prof. Bowman upon the occasion of his inauguration as Professor of New Testament Exegesis.

entertain such misgivings with regard to the issue as to inquire: "Can the Old Faith live with the New?" For fully half a century has this, the central institution of the Reformed Church in the United States, been familiar with the idea of an evolutionary process as essential not only to the proper understanding of nature and natural science, but as no less essential to a correct conception of history and theology.

The dominant principle of our theological system, viz., the Christological, has afforded us special advantage in guarding us against the errors of the purely scientific theory of evolution, and in providing against the "missing links" which baffle the investigations of science, and thereby has prevented the despair of thought to which all monistic and agnostic theories tend. The main fault to be found with the modern doctrine of evolution, as advocated by its professed champions, is not its advanced and liberal tendency, but rather its narrowness and false limitations.

Tracing the evolutionary process backward, we cannot stop with the *Bathybius* of Huxley or the *Monera* of Haeckel, but, with the author of the Book of Genesis, we go back infinitely further, to that from which all protoplasm proceeds: "In the beginning, God." Following the process of evolution from the most incomplete form of life to its supposed highest development in the cerebrum of man, we take an infinite step in advance, and find the culmination of the process in the God-Man, "crowned with glory and honor" in the heaven of heavens.

In the light of the Christological Principle evolution finds its true interpretation. It is not a movement from the highest to the lowest plane on earth simply; but a movement from eternity to eternity, as comprehended in Him who is the Alpha and the Omega, the ideal origin of all things and their teleology. All earthly evolution is but a half truth which finds its other half in the continuous evolution in the supernatural, heavenly world; so that the highest development which may be attained on earth is but a preparation for that which is perfect and which is to come.

The scope of the Christological Principle is not, therefore, limited to the science of theology as such. It is the regulative principle of all science; for only in its light can we study aright both the hidden things of nature and the deep things of God. The facts of natural science find their final interpretation in the science of the supernatural, and the philosophy of history can be rightly learned only in the light of the more comprehensive science of the Christology of history. The philosophy taught by St. Paul, viz., that the whole creation is summed up and perfected in the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, contains a germinal truth which is beginning to find its proper place in cosmological and theological science. Jesus Christ is the archetype, the organ and the end of the whole process of creation. All things were formed and all things continue in Him, by Him and for Him. (Col. 1: 16, 17.) As the final cause of the universe, He works in all its kingdoms, in all its genera and species, shaping their development from within toward consummation.*

Accordingly the whole purpose of the natural universe, organic and inorganic, reaches its completion in Jesus the Son of Man. In Himself He fulfills the teleology of nature, and thus is the only key that can unlock its hidden meaning. As the final outcome of the whole process of creation, and the fulfillment of the original intention and all the laws of normal humanity, He is the Light of the world, the One who illumines all realms of existence.

If, then, it is only by the application of the Christological Principle that we can interpret the things of nature, it is evident that only in the light of the same principle can we interpret the facts of revelation as these appear in the history of God's dealings with man, as presented in Sacred Scripture.

The feature of the modern doctrine of evolution which especially commends itself to Christian thought is that of progressive development, with which the Christological Principle is in full harmony. Only as the Christological Principle embodies

* *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Gerhart, p. 193.

the idea of progressive development can we apply it to divine revelation and its interpretation.

In the treatment of the theme,—The Interpretation of Scripture Progressive,—it is not my purpose to compare or weigh the various hermeneutical methods that have been and are now employed in the study of the Written Word. Rather do I desire to show that no principle of interpretation can be justly applied which does not have due regard for the idea of evolution as related both to revelation and its interpretation.

Progressiveness of interpretation is postulated by the nature of revelation, and proven by the entire history of Biblical Science. Revelation is the self-impartment and self-disclosure of God. As such, it presupposes a subject endowed with an aptitude corresponding to the nature of revelation. Man, created in the image of God and for God, by virtue of his Godlike constitution, is capable of receiving God's self-communications. It is, however, pre-eminently indispensable as a condition of all divine self-revelation that there be a process of revelation. God's truth can become man's truth only as the contents of revelation become the contents of human consciousness; only as they are wrought out within man by the help of the spiritually quickened cognitive faculties. Furthermore, the necessity for growth and a long educative process, such as is exhibited in the history of revelation, belongs to the fundamental laws of human consciousness.

Neither the individual nor the race could receive all the truth at once, nor any one truth in all its relations. Only by a continuous process, with differing stages and degrees, can the thoughts of God be wrought into the mind of man.

As "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," the faculty of spiritual discernment had to be imparted and enlarged, had to be made gradually capable of more and more clear apprehension from age to age. Therefore when we come to study this living movement of revelation, as presented in Sacred Scripture, we should not be surprised to find that it was in accordance with the conditions of society at each partic-

ular step of its course, and that the messengers of revelation, who were of the people, were limited by their condition, and bound under the burdens of their own generation.

What some are so ready to discover as faults in the Old Testament are only evidences of the unavoidable limitations of a partial and progressive revelation. "These very limitations, imperfections and moral deficiencies of the particular stages of revelation, so often alleged against the Bible, are among the signs which cannot be counterfeited of God's handwriting in it."*

Throughout the whole process there was from age to age an adaptation to the limits of the powers and to the moral necessities of mankind. In the Old Testament the progress is protracted, interrupted, and sometimes the movement seems to be that of retrogression. Revelation takes place in sundry parts and divers manners, and at times under disguises of earthly forms which suggest their incomplete and preparatory character. Yet, through it all, truth receives an enlarged interpretation as revelation draws near to the great disclosure.

Of the sacred books of the chosen nation, the Messianic idea is the all-controlling principle. From the first obscure promise in the garden down through the centuries, it is the Messianic idea which takes hold of the consciousness of the chosen people, and grows into clearer and fuller apprehension. There is no doubt as to what constitutes the centre of things in history. All prophecies, all institutions, all ages, look in one direction, and find in the advent of Jesus Christ the central fact in the world's history.

The Old Testament, with all its marks of human imperfection, is a substantially authentic record of that preparatory history, and a storehouse of those religious ideas, typical laws and ceremonies, and predictions of inspired prophets, which all looked forward to the time when the Word should become Flesh and tabernacle among men in the person of Jesus Christ.† For a time there seems to be a suspension of divine

* *Old Faiths in New Lights.* Smyth, p. 119.

† *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture.* Ladd, Vol. II., p. 567.

communications. For four hundred years there is an oppressive silence, when all voices of prophecy are hushed. But the Spirit of God is not at rest. Throughout the long and silent period He breathes upon the hearts of men, and at last His breathings find utterance in the loud voice in the wilderness: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord; the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

From out of the Old Testament we enter into the New. Out of the fulness of the times is unfolded the fulness of revelation. The root and stem of Jesse, which grew slowly through the centuries of the Old Dispensation, in a day buds and expands into the flower. How swift the course of events! One day is as a thousand years. The period of one human life comprehends germinally all the Gospel that we need to know under our present dispensation, all that we shall ever know till the final appearance of our Lord.

In the New Testament Scriptures are presented not only the facts of revelation and redemption as these appeared in the personal ministry of our Lord, but also a record of the apprehension and interpretation of these facts and of the teachings of Christ, by the apostles and evangelists.

The order of arrangement of the New Testament Scriptures is very significant as indicating the line of progress in the apprehension and interpretation of revelation. First, the Gospels,—the Acts and Words of our Lord; then the Acts and Epistles of His disciples. At first view this may seem like retrogression, a descent to a lower level, in that truths taught by the lips of the Incarnate Word are remitted to the discourses and writings of men. But this is just that progress in the knowledge of truth which the Lord Himself had predicted. Under the dispensation of the Spirit, the works and words of Jesus which men understood not while He was with them, are now expanded into larger meaning and clearer apprehension.

Moreover, the order of the several books is no less rational than historical. Christian doctrine must ground itself not in

the thoughts of men, but on the facts of revelation, of which it is itself the interpretation and application.

Furthermore, truth can be apprehended and disclosed only on the basis of facts which have been completed.

The death and resurrection of Jesus must take place before the doctrine of His death and resurrection can be brought to light.* Not till the Son of Man is glorified can all the meaning and virtue of the precedent facts be fully interpreted and applied, for the reason that not till then were they fully completed. Up to that time the Lord's disciples were passing through a period and were in a state of obscurity, described by the Lord's own saying: "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." The inability of the disciples to apprehend the full meaning of the Saviour's works and words was due in part to their want of spiritual discernment, but no less to the incomplete character of the Lord's ministry. His ministry could not be in advance of the development which took place in His personal history.

While it must be maintained that Christ came as the most perfect possible impartation and revelation in human form of the very life of God, and all that God had been graciously doing in history reached its perfect result in the Son of Man, who in the fullest sense was "the life and light of the world," yet, must it also be maintained that in the unfolding of His life, as the Son of Man, He conformed to all the laws of normal humanity. He grew in wisdom and in stature. He *became* perfect through suffering. He increased in favor with God. From a state of relative incompleteness He was ever attaining more and more unto the absolute perfection which could be accomplished only at the time of His glorification. Accordingly the entire life of Jesus in the flesh, from its beginning to its close, was not a complete revelation of the God-man. Only in His state of exaltation is to be found the ultimate completion of the Incarnation, and only in the light of His glorification can we rightly

* Bampton Lectures. *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament.* Bernard J., p. 46.

interpret His antecedent history. Indeed the clearest and fullest conception of the significance of the Incarnation can be secured no otherwise than by regarding it as a process, a growing union of God and man, begun at the nativity, and reaching its last possible height when the Son of Man sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on High. As not till then did Jesus in His person reach ultimate completion, so also His teaching, prior to His glorification, while it included the substance of all Christian doctrine, did not bear the character of finality. On reaching its highest point it announces its own incompleteness. There is yet to come a higher revelation of truth. The Spirit shall take the things of Christ and show them unto men. Thus the Lord made the removal of His own personal presence the basis of the largest spiritual development.

When the disciples saw their Lord ascend, they were in full possession of all the facts of which they were appointed to bear witness; but not until the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them did they apprehend the spiritual meaning, relations and consequences of those facts. Only then could they go forth as preachers of truth and righteousness, speaking "not in words which man's wisdom taught, but which the Holy Ghost taught." Now are fulfilled the mysterious promises of the Lord: "In that day ye shall know;" "He shall bring all things to your remembrance;" "He shall teach you all things;" "He shall guide you into all truth;" "He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

As by successive steps they are guided into the truth, the disciples now recall how imperfectly they had understood the facts of the Gospel, and how inadequately they had apprehended the teachings of their Lord; so that "the whole period of their intercourse with Him while He was on earth must have seemed to them as an initiatory stage, looking forward to the higher and fuller revelations of the Spirit."*

New apprehensions of truth, new views of former revelations, and dawns of the glory which shall be revealed at the last

*Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. Bernard, p. 58.

day, now burst in upon their enlarged vision, and continue to grow more and more distinct to their enlightened eye. In the Epistles, written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we find proof of the spiritual enlightenment promised in the words : "He shall guide you into all truth." So does the word, "He shall show you things to come," find its distinct fulfillment in the Apocalypse.

We see then that the whole collection of Sacred Writings presents to us a gradually progressive scheme, advancing through various stages, from the less complete to the more complete, until the whole course of divine teaching reaches its highest stage. Thus do the Sacred Scriptures correspond to the nature and history of revelation. Parallel with the progress of the communication from God is the progress of its apprehension by men. Each stage of progress is based on the facts and instructions which went before. "The law was given to the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the Prophets spake to those who were under the law; Jesus Christ came to those who had been taught by the Prophets; the Holy Spirit instructed those who had received Christ."*

Thus the permanent truth in the Old Testament is taken up by the New, confirmed, brought into connection with the person of Christ, and transformed by His Spirit.

Viewing revelation as a gradually progressive movement, it follows necessarily that its earlier stages should be characterized by incompleteness and imperfection, considered both objectively and subjectively; and that only in the increased light of later development can the former revelations be rightly understood and interpreted. The whole significance of the Word of God as contained in the Old Testament is to be found in the preparatory and anticipatory relation which it sustains to the final Word in Jesus Christ. Only in the light of the Incarnate Word glorified can we rightly interpret whatever pertains to the history of the chosen people.

Divine prophecy could become fully intelligible only in the

* *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament.* Bernard, p. 198.

light of its fulfillment. When therefore the light of the New Testament is thrown back upon the Old, new beauties are discovered on nearly every page; and prophecies, which were but half understood or misunderstood prior to the coming of Christ, are now clearly apprehended. In fact the whole of the Old Testament becomes clear only in the New, according to the striking expression of Augustine, "Novum Testamentum in Vatore latet, Vetus in Novo patet."

If, on the other hand, in the light of the New Testament we discover the blemishes of the Old Testament as well as its beauties, we have no cause to question its value and trustworthiness. In the periods of childhood and youth we do not expect to find the perfections of manhood. Nor should we ignore this same law of development in its relation to revelation as it moves forward through its various stages. On no rational ground can we expect to find in the Mosaic code of morals the fully developed and perfect principles of righteousness which were taught by Jesus Christ; for absolute truth came not by the former but by the latter. "The true morality of the Bible is its final morality", as clearly shown by Mozley in his fine lecture, "The End, the Test of a Progressive Revelation."

The discovery of ethical imperfections, and evidences of fallibility in the apprehension of revelation and in the records of the same, in the earlier periods, should not in any sense become an occasion for stumbling.

Faultlessness of form in the presentation of testimony invariably tends to weaken the force of testimony, in that it suggests collusion and dishonest pre-arrangement. On the other hand, it is a well-established maxim of jurisprudence: "*Mala grammatica non vitiat chartam*," based upon the principle: "*De minimis non curat lex*."

Judged by the same rigidly exact science, even discrepancies of statement in the testimony of witnesses do not necessarily impair the essential worth of the testimony.

The science of Biblical Hermeneutics admits of the application of the same liberal principle, without in any sense proving

unfaithful to the Word of God. The discovery of imperfection, and even error, does not rule out the fact of revelation, nor should it impair confidence in the general historical credibility and accuracy of Sacred Scripture.

Speakers and writers of truth may reveal marked contrariety in verbal statement; they may differ in their recollection of dates; they may even contradict one another as to unimportant facts; and yet the essential truthfulness of their testimony be unimpaired.

Exactness of details and precision in the setting forth of minutiae, are not the signs which mark great messages of truth; nor does their absence imply a lack of either inspiration or trustworthiness.

It is far better to acknowledge frankly that the presentation of the facts of revelation in its earlier stages was accomplished in connection with many imperfections and erroneous formal elements, than vainly to contend for inerrancy where it is not to be found. "We should not quarrel with God's method of making truth known to men."

But we have seen that the self-communications of God to man are marked by incompleteness in the New Testament as well as in the Old, that the Lord's apostles could not bear all the truth which He had to impart, and that the words of truth which He did speak to them were apprehended only by degrees and imperfectly. This view of the manner in which truth was gradually unfolded to the minds of the first teachers may seem to be in conflict with belief in their inspiration, inasmuch as it implies the ordinary processes of study, reflection, comparison, and a gradual increase in the fulness and proportions of their knowledge. Unquestionably the New Testament writings do appear to bear witness to such processes and such progress in the minds of their authors.

But there is in this view nothing derogatory to the fulness of their inspiration, or any reflection cast upon the trustworthiness of their testimony.

It may be granted that the idea of revelation as a process of

gradual unfolding of divine truth, which finds its counterpart in a corresponding progressive apprehension on the part of mankind, does conflict with every theory of inspiration that ignores or disparages the human element in the process of revelation.

Quite naturally the general subject of inspiration is suggested in connection with the discussion of our present theme. It is hardly possible at the present day to discuss freely any Biblical question without exciting the opposition of the advocates of pet "theories" of inspiration.

Any discussion which involves a departure from the traditional beliefs is likely to be met, in some quarters, with the cry of "disloyalty to truth," and to be condemned as an "assault upon the Bible itself."

One of the causes of the nervous agitation of many minds, as indicated by the current discussions in the religious press, is the fact that far too much deference has been shown to "theories" of inspiration in the study of the Bible, and in the discussion of problems pertaining to Biblical Criticism. Inspiration has its place, even a high place, in the Christian system, but it is not a question of such vast importance as to outweigh all others in the study of Sacred Scripture. It is significant that so little room has been assigned to inspiration in the Creeds and Confessions of the Church. In no one of the authoritative confessional standards does inspiration find a place as a clearly defined doctrine. Its peculiar hold upon the mind of the Church since the Reformation has been due to the sway of traditional belief.

Accepting the fact of inspiration, the manner in which the Spirit of God controlled the Biblical authors in their apprehension of revelation is not a matter of primary importance. Moreover it is a false principle that we can rightly interpret the Scriptures only on the basis of a supposed correct theory of inspiration. Any mind that is regulated and fettered by a theory of inspiration will, of necessity, show the marks of the narrow groove in which it moves.

In the study of Sacred Scriptures, while we should ever keep prominently before us the fact that they are the Word of God, we should at the same time give due recognition to the co-ordinate fact that they were written by men.

The fundamental fact which confronts us in all our inquiry into revelation, inspiration and interpretation, is that the Spirit of God and the spirit of man meet in harmonious union. Let this fact be clearly apprehended, and all questions as to the various theories of inspiration will find their proper place. We need not wait, as some suggest, for additional facts to aid us in the solution of the vexed problems which now disturb so many minds. The "discrepancies" and apparent "contradictions" in the Bible, it is claimed, may yet be fully explained and reconciled by the discovery of earlier Manuscripts which may serve to shed such light upon the Bible text as to settle all the vexed questions which now baffle the critics. In the meanwhile we are asked to maintain patiently "the attitude of confident expectation."

Strange comfort to offer the seeker after truth! No, it is not to Manuscripts, whatever light they may cast upon the science of Textual Criticism, that we are to resort for the explanation or reconciliation of the difficulties of Sacred Scripture. Even the finding of "original autographs," were that possible, would not settle the main problem with which we have to do. The signatures of Moses, Isaiah, Paul and John, might possibly prove authorship, but would afford no evidence that the writers were God's infallible amanuenses. All the searchings of "Lower Criticism" and of "Higher Criticism" will never disclose a more important and helpful truth than that which has been already so fully authenticated both by the facts of revelation and the deductions of reason, viz.: that the Bible is the Word of God in the words of man; and that, as such, it bears the impress of the perfections of the former and the impress of the imperfections of the latter.

Progressive Interpretation recognizes both the divine and the human elements in the Scriptures, and pays due regard to the

claims of both. It assigns to the Bible a unique position in the world of literature because of its pre-eminently divine contents. At the same time it recognizes in it human factors as real and conspicuous as they are in any uninspired work of human genius. Viewed from a literary standpoint, the Bible is not exempt from the ordinary tests by which all other books are tried. Its language being human, it must conform to the laws and categories of thought, and cannot be interpreted without regard to its grammatical or literal sense; and the historical events which it records cannot be accepted contrary to historical evidence. It must also be granted that every writer shall be interpreted in the light of his particular genius and culture, as well as the circumstances and conditions of his general outward life. The grammatico-historical method of interpretation is therefore indispensable to the thorough critical study of the scriptural text.

But mere grammatical and historical exposition can never penetrate the truth of Scripture in any vital sense. It may serve to open the way leading to the truth, but it cannot reveal the truth itself. Whatever service anatomical science may render in the study of man, it cannot reveal the truth, the life, of man. Neither can the philological dissection of Scripture bring to light the truth of Scripture.

More is required than the diligent application of the intellect to the Written Word, or earnest rational inquiry into its history and structure.

All language has its own distinctive life which can be rightly apprehended only in its relation to the mind and heart from which it proceeds; only as the interpreter looks through the outward form, the letter, into the spirit, the living thought of the word. The language of Scripture is to be understood in accordance with the same principle.

Revelation makes itself known through the medium of ordinary human language, which, as before stated, is governable by the ordinary rules of grammatical construction.

But what is our quest? Is it the form of words, the struc-

ture of sentences, historical conditions? No, we seek the truth, the revelation of God, although conveyed to us in the words of man. This at once places the Bible on a plane above that on which all other merely human books are studied, and exhibits the inadequacy of the grammatico-historical method of interpretation. The several authors, as subjects of heavenly inspiration, are occupied with supernatural and eternal things,—God's will and purposes.

In their own language, they disclose the mind of God, and thus in a peculiar sense declare the Word of God.

But we must guard against the error of holding such an abstract view of inspiration as to regard the Spirit of God as acting upon the human spirit in such manner as to violate the union that holds between the substance and the form of language. The subjects of inspiration speak primarily the thoughts of God, but only as His thoughts enter into their own minds and hearts and thus become their own in a real sense.

To regard their language as a mechanical vehicle for the abstract mind of God, would imply that the human is an outside medium simply, through which access may be had to the divine in its own altogether different order of existence. That however would be no revelation. Revelation as related to the inspired subject, implies a vital union between the human form and the divine substance-matter.

"The divine element and the human element meet together in the constitution of what is spoken, and they must be apprehended, therefore, each in the other to make it intelligible."*

The substance of revelation being divine, its apprehension cannot be by mere natural sense or understanding.

The cognitive faculty in man must relate itself directly to the divine content in the word; it must meet and wed it in love. It was by such spiritual marriage that revelation was made possible in the case of those who were inspired to speak and write the Word of God in the first instance; and only by a similar union can there be any right interpretation of the Scrip-

* *Life and Works of John W. Nevins.* Theodore Appel, p. 625.

tures. "He that is of God heareth God's words." "He that loveth not, knoweth not God." It is the spiritual understanding that comprehends the utterances of God's Spirit. Intuitively, yet through the intelligence, does truth come into the possession of him who loves it.

It needs however to be emphasized that in every instance of the self-communication of God and the impartation of truth, the recipient is freely active in the exercise of all his human powers. Although his powers of apprehension are supernaturally quickened, yet the divine does not so overpower the human as to interfere in any sense with its freedom. The theory that men have been inspired in such manner that divine truth has been made over to them in the form of ready-made ideas and doctrines, is, to say the least, psychologically indefensible. But there is no proof whatever that the Spirit of God ever came into such relations with any human spirit. The supposition conflicts with all known revelations of divine and human action. The old orthodox theory of inspiration which made the Bible-writers "secretaries," "pens," "harps," and even "writing-tablets," for fear lest error should enter, involves a conception of God and man which dishonors both alike. We may be well assured that whenever God used for His higher purposes the minds of men, He did not overpower their natural habits of expression, or hold individual genius in the grasp of His Almighty hand.

God cannot treat the mind of man as though it were a machine, and man cannot be inspired except as man, in the unity of his personality. Man, as a subject of revelation and inspiration, has received truth from God in accordance with the divine idea of man; none of the human faculties have been violated, or their laws even temporarily set aside.*

The growing dissatisfaction with the Post-Reformation dogma of inspiration, and with many of the traditional beliefs concerning the Bible, is not the outgrowth of a merely negative and destructive spirit of criticism. Higher Criticism could not

* *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture.* Ladd, vol. 2, p. 425.

have secured such a firm hold upon the thought of the age, nor won for itself such general, and I may add, respectful recognition, if it did not embody along with its errors some principles of truth. Some of its claims, it may be granted, are characterized by the extremeness and one-sidedness peculiar to all reactionary movements.

But as is the case with all reactionary movements in the Church, so with regard to the present, its real significance is to be found in the valid claims of great truths whose rights need to be asserted in order to meet a want which has come to be deeply felt in the consciousness of the Church.

The following of the "Liberal School," as it is designated with more or less opprobrium, is far greater than is at present indicated by those who freely speak and write their convictions. Both by the ministry and laity, in rapidly increasing numbers, as well as by Theological Schools, there is coming to be felt more or less discontent with the restraints which hitherto have repressed the spirit of scientific inquiry; and there is a growing dissatisfaction with all systems of thought which exalt the divine element at the expense of the human, in revelation, in Sacred Scripture and in religious experience. Nor can this marked trend of the Christian thought of the age be successfully met by counter-movements whose chief strength is to be found in the alarum-cries of "rationalism" and "skepticism." The faith and piety of many who are prominently identified with the "Liberal School" have been sufficiently well attested to withstand all such purely negative opposition. Let whatever is true and good in Higher Criticism be duly acknowledged and honored; for then only is it possible to come to any right issue with it in the effort to expose and resist its errors.

The Christian faith has nothing to fear from the light that may be thrown upon it by means of scientific investigation; and Christian scholarship can never lose, but may gain much, by holding itself open to the light of truth from whatever source it may proceed.

The progressive interpretation of Scripture draws all possi-

ble help from all the resources of human knowledge. It keeps pace with the general progress of science, philology, criticism, history and philosophy; all of which it employs in its service. It will not quarrel either with science or with reason. Between revelation and science, between faith and reason, it recognizes no conflict. It recognizes all truth as coming from God, and as bound together in one universal system, of which Jesus Christ is the centre, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

There is no such thing possible as divine revelation which contravenes the constitutional forms of human reason. Revelation is neither irrational nor supra-rational. On the contrary it postulates the idea of rationality. That does not imply that revelation is rational in the sense of being discoverable by the natural reason; but that whatever the Spirit of God teaches, can be learned only through the organ of the spiritually enlightened reason. The question, therefore, can religion and science, faith and reason, be reconciled? involves a false assumption, and is totally misleading.

Reason and faith, science and religion, conflict and stand in need of reconciliation, only when unnaturally divorced, or when forced into a false attitude toward one another.

But while we recognize the just claims of reason and science as related to revelation, its apprehension and interpretation, they should never be regarded as primary sources of the knowledge of spiritual truth.

The progressive historical movement of revelation, as we have seen, is an evolution primarily of forces which are not of earthly origin. Accordingly, when we come to study the records of revelation, we find that all earthly and merely human helps are of but secondary value. Hebrew and Greek scholarship, the knowledge of civil and social conditions, of geography and history,—these are of service only as held in subserviency to a mind which is in loving sympathy with the Personal Truth, a mind illumined by the Spirit of Christ.

It is this divine factor, the abiding presence of the Holy

Spirit in the Church, as the constant guide into the truth, which we recognize and emphasize as the fundamental principle of the progressive interpretation of Scripture.

The outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples of Christ on the day of Pentecost was but the beginning of the Dispensation of the Spirit. It was the birthday of the Christian Church; and, as such, its fullness of powers was not that of maturity and completeness, but a fullness peculiar to a birth, viz., that of potentiality and normativity.

The birth-contests, or potentialities, could be unfolded only by a progressive development in the onward history of the Christian Church, corresponding to the development which took place in the personal history of our Lord.

Accordingly, as has already been shown, the apostles themselves were not led at once into all the promised truth; but, under the leadership of the Spirit, were conducted step by step, and stage beyond stage, into ever fuller and clearer apprehension of the things of the Spirit. Their progress in doctrine can be clearly traced in the New Testament.

There are some who maintain that it is a justifiable inference that the later preaching and writing of the apostles are worthy of superior regard on account of their obvious connection with the fuller revelation of truth.

The idea is consistent with the idea of religious life in general, as related to the individual believer. Here the process of evolution is generally admitted. Religion does not pervade the entire nature of the individual at once, but gradually and progressively. What comes to be actualized in the end, is only that which existed in principle in the beginning of the process.

In the life of the Church a similar process is involved. "This process must actualize or evolve from the idea of Christianity, age after age, what was not apprehended in the consciousness of the Church before, till it shall become complete finally in the new heavens and the new earth."*

The same Spirit who communicated the mind of God in the

* Dr. Nevins's introduction to "The Principle of Protestantism," p. 11.

original facts and ideas of revelation, makes use of these facts and ideas as scripturally fixed, for His continued means of communication. All the normative elements of truth enclosed in Scripture are not only preserved from age to age, but they are illumined and expanded into fuller meaning by the same Spirit who originally bestowed them.

The idea of the progressiveness of interpretation is postulated by the idea of the Church as a progressive realization of the spiritual presence and life of Christ upon the earth. The Spirit continues to guide men into all truth, to take the things of Christ and to show them unto men.

Consequently the faculty of interpretation possessed by the Church is a growing faculty; but the growth does not consist primarily in the increase of Christian scholarship.

There are many who believe that the knowledge of revelation is progressive, but mainly in the sense of accumulating new material in an external, mechanical way, through the helps of advanced learning and improved hermeneutical appliances.

The measure of truth is thus supposed to be enlarged by accretion from age to age, and in this sense it is understood that there is progress and gradual development in the sphere of religious knowledge. Much of the boasted progress in Biblical knowledge, of which we hear so much at the present day, is progress of this outward sort. But the development and progress of Christianity is never the result of accretional enlargement. New life and new truth cannot be added to the Christian system. Ideally it is complete in its own nature from the beginning; so that whatever increase of life and truth there may be in its course of historical development, these are but the unfolding of its own potential contents in the consciousness of the Church. The very nature of Christianity and the constitution of the Church involve a process which can be complete only when revelation itself becomes complete. And all this will be nothing more than the full evolution of the life that was in Christ from the beginning, and the full power of which has always been present in the Church, struggling

through all ages towards the last glorious "manifestation of the sons of God."

"We must distinguish in the Church between idea and manifestation. As to her idea, or as comprehended in Christ, she is always complete; in the way of manifestation, however, she passes, like every one of her members, outwardly and inwardly, through different stages of life, until the ideal inclosed in Christ shall be actualized in humanity, and His body appear thus in the ripeness of complete manhood."*

What now is involved in this conception of revelation and its apprehension as a gradual historical process running through the ages? No one who has a clear conception of the historicity of divine revelation can look upon it as finished and stationary from the beginning, with the knowledge of its truths clearly bounded and defined at every point.

Such was not the nature of Christianity in the Apostolic Church, with all the fullness of power which characterized it; and notwithstanding the fact that the apostles themselves were endowed with exceptional gifts, and peculiarly qualified for receiving and expounding the Gospel of Christ.

Passing out of the Apostolic and normative period, the Church moves forward in accordance with the principle of evolution proclaimed by the Lord Himself: "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

The consciousness of the Church at the beginning of the second century did not, and could not, include all that belonged to it in the centuries following. The Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers set forth certain phases of truth with a vividness, precision and force, which gave them, as it were, a new place in the apprehension of men.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century were as near to Christ as the Greek and Latin Fathers, and had the advantage of the many centuries of Christian history which had intervened. The truth growing through the centuries impelled the Reformers to the advanced position which they occupied.

* *The Principle of Protestantism.* Dr. Schaff, p. 179.

The principle of Justification by Faith was not a new truth evolved from the brain of Luther; nor was it an old truth merely revived in the consciousness of the Church in such sense as to re-assert its forgotten claims.

The consciousness of the whole Church, through the ages, had been opening to the light of the Spirit which in the sixteenth century was at hand to disclose, as never before, the meaning of the main principle of Pauline theology; and thus by means of its clearer and fuller apprehension it was advanced to a new and higher place in the realm of Christian doctrine. But not all the meaning of the Word of God was disclosed to the Reformers of the sixteenth century. The Material and Formal Principles of Protestantism, with all the prominence given to them, did not then reach their last point of development, or receive an exhaustive interpretation of their meaning. Nor have the problems which confronted the mind of the Church in the sixteenth century been set aside as dead issues. They are no less living issues now than then, and may yet disclose to the apprehension of the Church a larger meaning than was unfolded to the consciousness of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, and the Reformers in general. So with regard to all the truths contained in Sacred Scripture. Their interpretation is conditioned by the varying needs of humanity from age to age.

Interpretation is not progressive in the direction merely of discerning the meaning of revelation; but it is progressive also in the sense of applying revelation to the practical needs of humanity. Truths taught by Christ and the apostles did not find their full interpretation and adaptation during the infancy of the Christian Church, for the reason that they were largely anticipatory of the needs that would arise in the onward course of history. Every age in some way takes part in working out or illustrating the revelation of God; and thereby meets a present need, and, at the same time, contributes somewhat to the body of truth for future thought and knowledge.

Nor is it a groundless assumption that the revelations of God, which have been scripturally fixed, may, through the en-

lightenment of the Holy Spirit, yet come to be apprehended by the mind of the Church with a clearer vision and in fuller measure than at any former period of the Church's history. Does not the promise of the Lord that the Holy Spirit shall guide into all truth admit of such interpretation?

Certainly we are not warranted in so narrowing the meaning of that promise as to limit the guiding activity of the Holy Spirit to the opening of the minds of the apostles to the "all truth" which was potentially and ideally revealed to them on the day of Pentecost. The Holy Ghost was sent to be the constant Guide and Inspirer of believers, that thus He might ever take the things of Christ and show them unto men.

The movement of Christianity is always forwards, never backwards. All attempts therefore at repristination by means of a return to Apostolic times, and all efforts to fashion the thinking of the Church after the moulds of the Ante-Nicene age, or any later period, is a violation of the very nature of life, as well as of the law of history. As well might the effort be made to force the growing plant back into its embryonic form, or to convert matured manhood into the budding child.

The evolution of Christianity in general, and of the truth of Sacred Scripture also, is not contradicted by the facts of history. The long dark nights during which the truth seemed to be repressed by the forces of error, may not properly be regarded as breaks in the historic process. In the unfolding of truth there are no lacunae or leaps. The continuity is unbroken. As the history of error runs parallel with that of truth, there are times when the accumulations of error become so amassed as to overshadow and obscure the truth. For centuries, as during the Middle Ages, there may seem to be a falling away as compared with the preceding stages; but while false tendencies work themselves out through a long and dark period, the ultimate tendency of Christianity is forwards not backwards.

During such periods truth pursues its course mainly as an undercurrent, which at last brings to the surface and sweeps

aside the false elements which entered into the historic stream.

The main significance of Protestantism lies in the fact that it was the outcome of the struggle of truth with error during the Middle Ages, not by means of negative protest simply, but rather by the assertion of positive principles of truth and righteousness. Nor did these positive elements enter into it by means of a revival of the truth as apprehended by the consciousness of the Church during the early centuries of Christianity. The Reformation was the bursting forth of the *light* of the Middle Ages. "He that has no heart for the excellencies of this period, the beauty that belongs to the Middle Ages, must be wanting in genuine culture, or at least in all right historical feeling. * * * * It should be borne in mind that the Middle Ages after all are the cradle of the Reformation."*

The progress involved in the Reformation was that of an unbroken line. "Even the tenth century, with all its darkness, must be considered in advance of the third,"† Thus the entire Reformation movement was the product of the more advanced life of the Middle Ages, as this latter was the progressive continuation of the life of early Christianity.

As to the Reformation itself, it was not a goal, but a *movement*, as generally and properly designated. Protestantism, no more than Romanism, should be regarded as the ultimate form of Christianity. Any system of truth which can be defined by an "ism," advertises its partial nature and its incompleteness. The very term Protestant, as applied to Christianity, points simply to a stage in the process of the development of Christian life and truth, and defines but an arc of the great sphere of humanity. Christianity in its ideal character comprehends the whole of humanity. Only when the whole process of history shall have come to its proper conclusion in the glorification of humanity, in its wholeness, can the universal system of truth,

*The Principle of Protestantism. Schaff. p. 138.

† Dr. Nevin's Introduction to "The Principle of Protestantism," p. 24.

"the one system of God," be said to be perfectly rounded and complete.

"Christianity must be regarded as the only proper idea of humanity itself. It is to penetrate all modes of existence alike with its own life, and take them up organically into its own constitution. Till this be done, humanity must remain imperfect and the idea of humanity cannot be said to be evolved fully in the world. And yet who will dare to say that the history of the Church has not this evolution for its object?"*

It follows necessarily, therefore, that as yet no system of doctrine can be so complete as to admit of no advance, and that there are no absolutely finished parts in the Christian system of truth. In no other sense can any system of truth be finished than that of being set aside as inadequate to the needs of the age. No explanations of sin, of the atonement, of the sacraments, can be accepted as final, however strongly they may be fortified with scriptural proofs and scriptural argument. Interpretations which are fitting for one age are not in all instances suited to the requirements of a later age. Not that they are false, but that they are inadequate to the increased aptitude and enlarged vision to which the Church has attained.

Any method of interpretation which is bound by the letter, or by a doctrinal system of a given age, does violence to the nature of truth. Limitation is involved in all interpretation. We have seen in the history of revelation that the infinitude of the divine could impart its fullness to the human only in proportion to the growing capacity of the human. So the infinitude of truth becomes limitable through the finiteness of human apprehension and interpretation. However satisfactory, therefore, may be the Hermeneutics of a particular age or school, it can not serve as an adequate standard for subsequent ages. Hermeneutics must follow along the course of truth as historically unfolded, the solutions of one age serving as the bases for the more comprehensive solutions of a later period, keeping pace with the Christian Church as she advances, not into

*Dr. Nevin's Introduction to "The Principle of Protestantism," p. 24.

new truths, but into larger truth, as disclosed by the Holy Spirit.

For centuries the interpretation of the Bible was so controlled by the mechanical theory of inspiration and by rigid dogmatic systems, that critical and historical methods could gain no encouraging recognition. Now, however, Higher Criticism has come to exercise such a wide influence over the thought of the age, that many are led to entertain misgivings and fears as to what they regard as novel theories and unwonted conclusions. It is well to be jealously watchful of the Old Faith while it is being tested by the critical methods which are now so generally employed in the study of Sacred Scripture. At the same time, however, we need to assume such an attitude toward the newer order of thought as to kindly welcome whatever of truth it may bring to us, even though it should compel modification and reconstruction, if not abandonment, of some long cherished opinions.

The Church cannot afford to drive from the field of Biblical study advanced Christian scholarship because it comes into conflict with traditional beliefs and confessional standards, which may have served well as moulds for the thought of former generations. Rather should she encourage all honest critical research, and give to its results whatever consideration and approbation they may merit.

As for the Old Faith, it has nothing to fear from the most intense light and the most searching criticism to which it may be subjected.

After all the work of the critics, and notwithstanding the marked variations in doctrinal belief, and the changing methods of interpretation, the Bible remains essentially the same through the ages—"the great, sublime, enduring work of the Eternal, who loves righteousness and hates iniquity."

Faith in "the Word of God that liveth and abideth forever," lies deeper than any difficulties and discrepancies upon the surface of the Bible, and cannot be shaken or disconcerted by the confused noise of destructive criticism.

Out of the present conflict the Bible will come forth without losing any of its living power, while it may gain somewhat in freedom and solid scientific strength.

Destructive Criticism may sweep away some of the traditional beliefs concerning the Bible, and disprove claims which the spiritually-enlightened reason rejects; but the promise of the Lord will remain unimpaired, not a jot or tittle of the true Word of God shall ever pass unfulfilled.

It is consistent with the idea of truth as historical that the same light which shone more and more clearly to the perfect day in the divine self-revelation, recorded in Scripture, is still shining in the history of the kingdom of God.

The same Holy Spirit who gave the religious contents of the Bible to men will continue to enlighten the Church and to secure her unflinching adherence to them.*

The promise of the Lord that "the Holy Spirit shall guide into all truth," is a promise to us as well as to the apostles. Our day is in advance of theirs. The heritage of well-nigh nineteen centuries of Christian history should be regarded as of vast account, not only to the Church, but to the individual member who loves the truth, and, under the guidance of the Spirit, yearns for more truth. It may be an optimistic, yet it is a warrantable belief that the race, under the guidance of Christian conceptions and ideals, is advancing in moral and religious life, and that in the light of all its advancing knowledge it will look more and more "upon the face of Jesus Christ."

But whatever progress we may make in the knowledge of truth, while bound to the earthly sphere, we should ever look forward to greater disclosures. Divine knowledge is incomplete not only because the present state of believers is not final and perfect, but also for the reason that the revelation of God in Christ is not now ultimate and complete.

We wait for the second coming of Jesus Christ. That epoch will be the final manifestation of the glory of God. Only in

* *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture.*—Ladd, Vol. 2, p. 211.

the light of that glory will many of the mysteries of the Word of God, hidden through the ages, and even now but half understood, and often misunderstood—only in the light of that glory will they receive their full and final interpretation. Then, when the glory of the terrestrial shall be transformed into the glory of the celestial will the wholeness of divine-human truth be realized; and then "shall we see face to face, and know even as also we are known."

II.

INTRODUCTION TO A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE.

BY REV. W. A. HELFFRICH, D.D.*

If the commentator knows not the heaven-wide difference between the interpretation of the Allegory and the allegorical Interpretation, this is an intellectual calamity. But if he knows how an allegorical writing is to be interpreted, and at the same time tortures such allegorical writing until it speaks in the sense of the letter, in the interest of current opinions (whether critical, doctrinal, or in the form of the so-called Christian consciousness), this is an ethical scandal.—LANGER.

ALTHOUGH the number of books written upon the Revelation of St. John the Divine is large, it can be said of scarcely any one of them that it was written in vain. The ground had first to be viewed and prepared before the adequate structure could be erected. Many an effort served in its day a good purpose, in this respect, which now is either antiquated or entirely unknown. Owing to arbitrary hermeneutical methods the Book has been abused to a remarkable degree; and yet each exposition, written from the standpoint of faith, has contributed something toward the accomplishment of the design cherished by all. For amid the great variety of error which appeared in the interpretation of the picture language of the Apocalypse

* As has been generally known, the author wrote a popular commentary on the Apocalypse some years ago, in the German language, which is ready for the press. A translation of the introductory observations is found in the above article. A sample of the work is thus given to the public; the wish of many friends of the author to see a part of the work in English dress is gratified, and the translator's promise, that of saying something further in reference to the Revelation of St. John, is in part fulfilled. It is his intention to complete his review of Mr. Smith's work. But he finds in Dr. Helffrich's preface so much that should be said, and so clearly set forth, that he is glad to make use of the Doctor's work and the Doctor's authority for the accomplishment of the end which he had in view from the beginning, that, namely, of clearing up some questions regarding the significance of the book, and the method of interpretation it calls for. He is surprised to find the author coinciding with him in most important particulars; and takes pleasure in allowing him to speak for himself before an English-reading public. The foot-notes are added, with Dr. Helffrich's permission, by the undersigned. W. M. R.

they had their eye directed to Christ and his Kingdom. The utterance of so much that was not only strange and foolish occasioned investigation and necessitated refutation. Thus the laws and principles of a sound exegesis were ascertained, guessing done away with, and more satisfactory results secured.

The Revelation of St. John occupies a unique position in the canon of the Sacred Scriptures. As bearing chiefly upon events thereafter to come to pass, it may be co-ordinated with the prophetic books of the Old Testament; but its importance reaches far beyond that of theirs. It is the conclusion and completion of all the prophecies in the Kingdom of God on earth. The prophecies of the Old Covenant rested on the pre-Christian structure of that Kingdom, as also upon the coming of Christ; they further contain minute descriptions of human history's "last times." But the Apocalypse has in its rear the first coming of our Lord, His work of redemption and the founding of the Christian Church; accordingly, with greater comprehensiveness and accuracy it prophesies in reference to the Church's course here on earth and its consummation in the Kingdom of glory. Christ with His Kingdom as Champion and Victor, His last coming for the glorification of His redeemed people is the subject of this prophetic book. By this theme is signalized its paramount significance above all else in this most important class of inspired literature.*

* On Chap. I, v. 1—"This is the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave Him"—the author has the following: "That is, this book contains the revelation of Jesus Christ, as Christ Himself communicated it to the Apostle John, that the contents of it might be written down, and of which writing this book was to be the result. The Revelation accordingly is not the work of St. John, but that of the triune God, imparted to the apostle by Christ, the divine Logos. The Apocalypse, as a composition, may be regarded as the book which, as it ends, fitly completes and closes the sacred canon of the Christian revelation. It must be regarded as the ripe fruitage of the history of the faith, doctrine and prophecy of the Kingdom of God. As such, as in the past, so in the future, it furnishes a firm support upon which the Church of Christ securely reposes, confidently knowing, that amid all the storms of the world-conflict with the power of darkness, with the advent of Her Lord the victory is surely hers."

In spite of the numerous attacks which have been made upon the Revelation, it has ever retained its hold upon the confidence and regard of God's people. In no age of the Church has its authority been shaken. Whilst it always proved itself to be in general the richest fountain of spiritual life, so, too, that of precious consolation and encouragement in times when the Church's fidelity to the faith she professed involved the baptism of blood. If this was the case in days that are passed, much more will it be so in those that are to come, inasmuch as its mysteries are becoming more fully disclosed and its predictions confirmed by events as they occur in the on-going history of the world. No good reason can be assigned why the Apocalypse has not been expounded, made accessible and brought nearer to the laity or unlearned portion of the Church's membership. It does not suffice that the clergy come to an understanding of this portion of God's Word by means of erudite treatises and elaborate commentaries. The people must also have it. It was originally addressed to the Churches, as we are told in its introductory chapter.* If

* "Bengel employs language in his 'Erbauliche Reden über die Offenbarung Johannes,' which is applicable among others to his own *historical* method of interpretation. At the opening of Chap. VI. he says: 'We have now considered five chapters, and we have found little reference to the history of the Church, although the purpose of the book is to show what is to come to pass. But now these prophecies begin. If now we regard the wants of those to whom we are addressing ourselves, we shall have little to say.' Bengel felt accordingly that the Apocalypse, according to his exposition of it, would be unenjoyable for the great majority of Christians; and in spite of all his unfolding it remained unintelligible. This should have prompted him to subject his method to a severe scrutiny. For it is scarcely supposable that a Book should be intended for the limited circle of the learned, whose contents and scope bear so directly upon the membership of the Church. The Revelation does not look to the interests and needs of scholarship. For what robs it of its intelligibility for unlearned Christians robs it for the learned of its edifying power. Even the intellectual wealth and the rare unction of a Bengel (Hengstenberg quotes him, by the way, on almost every page, and ten times more than any other authority) has not been able to prevent many portions of his '*Erklärte Offenbarung*' from being no more edifying than an *altfränkischer* compendium of universal history." Hengstenberg on the Apoc. I. p. 326.

Church-members but understood the Apocalypse, and thus could distinguish the signs of the times, what an immense gain for the Church's spiritual life and the cause of Christ in general would be the result! How many might be saved from the satanic spirit of secularization (*e. g.* in the form of materialism, pessimism, and unbelief in general), which, in our day, more than ever before, is struggling for the ascendancy, and threatens to move forward with ever-increasing gigantic strides!

The Revelation is not only, as to its contents, a reproclamation of the whole Gospel, inasmuch as resting upon Christ as the chief corner-stone, it affords the Church a complete and harmonious series of the most joyous and glorious messages, but, more than this, it is the key-stone of the Bible, and foretells in advance the history of Christ's work on earth, and informs us how this movement begins and has its end in His Kingdom of glory. The Revelation pre-supposes all that the Gospels set forth. In all its predictions and sublime representations, it starts and moves forward on this ground. As a historical narrative, it holds in the closest connection with the spirit-world by means of its exalted visions and picture language; but as regards the events which it represents as taking place hereafter, many of its statements still remain veiled in obscurity. Still it sheds light—bright light—upon the history of the world. On a large scale it presents a complete picture of that which is to come to pass; which as such is adequately distinct, but it allows minute particulars to remain unexplained until the proper time. If the Revelation, together with the remaining prophetic books of the Bible, were verbal and literal predictions, there would be involved such a violent in-working upon the formation of history as to prejudice the freedom of human development. The crown of revelation is bound up with human liberty as a factor in history. Accordingly, prophecy in the Bible throughout is more or less obscure, whilst in the apocalypse, especially, the language of the seven thunders remains unsealed. Still, Revelation is light. Keys to the images are found in the symbolism of the Bible. The path of

the history of the Christian Church is here indicated in general in terms that are adequately accurate and clear.

The book is a revelation and God is the revealer of it. First of all it was given to St. John. The Apostle wrote as directed by Christ. The contents, with all its imagery, predictions, threats, were shown and announced to him. This is a fact which in these modern days should be carefully considered, so that false views and conceptions may be avoided. An article recently appeared in one of our leading magazines from the pen of a writer laying claim to great learning, in which he subjected the form, style and imagery of the book to a critical investigation. According to this author, who institutes an extended comparison between the Apocalypse and the books of the Old Testament, the Apostle must have drawn not only upon the Prophets but upon heathen mythologies for his images, visions, allegories and expressions. Such a theory, so far from explaining the facts, does the utmost violence to them. It goes upon the supposition that St. John did nothing more than compile the Revelation. If in the latter we find representations similar to those in the prophets, or even identically the same words, it must not by any means be necessarily inferred that they were borrowed thence. This is a proof rather that it is the same covenant God of revelation who speaks as well by the Apostles as by the Prophets. The writers of the Old Testament and St. John the Divine drew from the same source. Were there a real discrepancy between them, there would be just reason for doubting the truth of Revelation. God, who is infinite in His perfections, is an unchangeable being. Accordingly, His words, truths and ways remain ever the same. Upon the divine unchangeability, as its basis, must rest every safe method of the interpretation of revelation. For just as He is the same in His being or nature, so must He be the same in His ways notwithstanding the variety and manifoldness of His works. His revelation-pictures and representations are all taken from the life of nature and spirit; and back of them all lie truths which could find expression in no other form. Sun,

moon and stars, earth, sea and islands, fountains, streams and ocean, lightning, thunder and earthquake, fire, smoke and ashes, wind, storm and voices, light and darkness; so also beside much else, angels, spirits and souls; all these objects, as they occur in the Sacred Scriptures, have a fixed meaning as related either to the mind-life or the Spirit world. On this fixed sense of its picture-language the symbolism of the Bible is built, and in connection with it is a symbolical method of interpretation. As this opens itself, the images subject themselves to explanation, and thus is found a basis for satisfactory exposition.* .St.

* "The early prophecies were not so framed that a literal interpretation had sufficed to understand them in their full sense. They were rather hints or intimations of the Spirit for the spirit. Likewise the entire history and legislation of Israel was so stated in the books of Moses that a sign-language is to be recognized, by which were indicated divine, mysterious and eternal counsels for the development of God's covenant with His people. But in order to reach the sense of the Spirit the Israelite had to sink himself with love and devotion into the history and law of his nation, and in a priestly spirit to give himself over to the inspiration of God and His Spirit. Such hearts, prepared in this way, were chosen by Jehovah to be His prophets."—Dr. Schmieder, of the Seminary of Wittenberg, in Von Gerlach's *Bibel-Werk*. See his introduction to Isaiah.

"For it is an excellent observation which hath been made upon the answers of our Saviour Christ to many of the questions which were propounded to Him, how that they are impertinent to the state of the question demanded; the reason whereof is, because not being like man, which knows man's thoughts by his words, but knowing man's thoughts immediately, He never answered their words, but their thoughts. Much in like manner is it with the Scriptures, which . . . are not to be interpreted only according to the latitude of the proper sense of the place, and respectively towards that present occasion whereupon the words were uttered, or in precise congruity or contexture with the words before or after, or in contemplation of the principal scope of the place; but have in themselves, not only totally or collectively, but distributively, in clauses and words, infinite springs and streams of doctrine to water the Church in every part. And therefore, as the literal sense is, as it were, the main stream or river, so the moral sense chiefly, and sometimes the allegorical or typical, are they whereof the Church hath most use; not that I wish men to be bold in allegories, or indulgent or light in allusions, but that I do much condemn that interpretation of the Scripture which is only after the manner as men use to interpret a profane book."—Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," xxv. (17).

John, in no sense of the word, imitated or copied from the Old Testament prophets, but he wrote down what was shown to him—what he saw and heard. All this, of course, had in reality to agree and correspond with the disclosures and statements of preceding prophets. Hence the resemblance of the Revelation of St. John with its prophecies, its picture-language and visions, to the Old Testament writings. The same Spirit which spoke and worked in Isaiah and Daniel, used St. John as His organ, for all revelations in the Kingdom of God issue from one and the same source.*

* "Just as God appeared to St. John (Rev. iv.), so did He appear to Isaiah (iv.) and to Ezekiel (i.). We, however, have not to explain our vision as if it grew out of the former ones. *St. John did not imitate them.* God really appeared to St. John in the manner here described. The vision of Apoc. iv. explains itself in an entirely independent way."—Ebrard, p. 224.

On i. 10: "*I was in the Spirit*," the author comments as follows: "The apostle was elevated into an ecstatic state (*entsückt*), one into which prophets, apostles and other men of God were transported by the Holy Ghost, in which the ordinary natural consciousness was withdrawn, and the spiritual world was surveyed by the inner eye or the faculty of spiritual intuition. This phenomenon comes under the category of the miraculous, and accordingly is insusceptible of explanation. How it comes to pass is not explained by the statement that a divine spiritual life conveys itself into our natural life, and, by illuminating the human spirit, enables it to behold and disclose things hidden and future. This is, however, the statement of a truth which is plainly taught in the Bible from beginning to end. The angel (many like Düsterdieck take the word in a generic sense, whilst Lange concedes that this angel represents Christ, and the sealing angel in Ch. vii., the Holy Spirit.—Tr.) of revelation elevated the apostle into this ecstatic condition in order that he might see and hear what Christ purposed to reveal to him concerning the future of His Kingdom here upon the earth."

"Man in this way exists really in two worlds. In his physical organism he belongs at all points to the world of nature, the system of things seen and temporal, with which he stands in continual communication through his bodily senses. In his spiritual organism he is just as intimately comprehended in the world of spirit, the system of things unseen and eternal, which lies wholly beyond the range of his senses, although it is all the time touching him in fact and making itself felt upon his life in a different way. The difference between these two orders of existence with man, however, is not just that between body and spirit generally considered; for the distinguishing life of man, that by which he differs from the mere animal, is primarily and essentially all in his

In order now that the Book may find its proper explanation, so far as this accords with the divine purpose and plan, it is necessary that its sense be gradually unfolded by men gifted with the power of seeing into the deep things of God. As little could be accomplished by mere conjecture, a definite method of interpretation had to be found which on good ground could claim to be the right one. Many attempts were made until Dr. Lange was led to a view of the Apocalypse, according to which more light has been thrown both upon the form and contents of the Book than by any other expounder of this part of God's word.

Already in the earliest period of the history of the Christian Church there appeared commentaries on the Revelation. All these adhered to the idea of a literal reign on the part of Christ of a thousand years; and all took for granted that this reign was immediately at hand. Under the influence of the false doctrine that pervaded the early church, this doctrine of a thousand years' reign was degraded into a wild Chiliasm; for just, namely, as the Jews conceived the coming of Christ in a carnal way, so that His Kingdom for them was to be a purely temporal one, so the worldly-minded false teachers in the first centuries of Christianity formed carnal conceptions of the second advent of our Lord. The result of this was to be nothing more nor less than a world-kingdom. This is the doctrine that was designated as Chiliasm. After the Roman Catholic Church established itself, the doctrine was proclaimed that this thousand year reign had already been entered upon—that

mind, and only by derivation from thence in his body. But his mind itself is so constituted as to have in it, so to speak, two different regions, one looking directly into the natural world through the body, and the other opening principally into the spiritual world. Hence, properly speaking, the difference between the external man and the internal man, some sense of which is found entering into the deeper thought of the world through all ages. It is not simply with the regenerate and righteous that such dualism has place; it belongs to our life here universally. Man is by his creation at once both spiritual and natural, the denizen of two worlds. That is his distinction from the beast, which is natural only and not spiritual.—Dr. J. Williamson Nevin. *Article on Christianity and Humanity.* *MER. REV.*, Octo., 1873, pp. 470, 471.

it began with the first coming of Christ. When Protestantism arose, it was stigmatized by Roman Catholics as Anti-christ, whilst Protestants in turn insisted upon it that the sacred writers, in using the word Anti-christ, had precisely the Papacy in view. The earlier Protestants, however, thought that these thousand years of the Apocalypse belonged either to the past, or was about coming to an end. Soon, however, the error was perceived. Then it was taught, after the example of the early Fathers, that this reign is still in the future. The Roman view contradicted the teaching of the book itself so plainly that it was resisted with confidence and zeal. The Protestant theologians adhered almost unanimously to the doctrine of their church on this subject. Only here and there one like Hengstenberg lapsed back to the solution of the question adopted by the Roman Catholic teachers. Since the Reformation many commentaries have appeared, as well as treatises on the Apocalypse, representing the most various and divergent points of view. Some attempted a literal interpretation, and were not intimidated by the monstrosities which were to be matters of faith for Christian believers. Others explained it historically, without regard to the requirements of a biblical system of symbolism. Thus the Book was interpreted according to general and ecclesiastical history, and not the latter according to the former. Others again adopted an allegorical method. Thus, through the labors of many, the only proper and satisfactory method was reached. Hitherto the arrangement of the composition had not been ascertained; many things were joined which did not belong together, and many were sundered which were intended to stand in closest connection.

Before the real arrangement of the Apocalypse was ascertained, it had become evident that it did not set forth a single on-flowing course of events in a continuous narrative. The number seven occurring seven times indicated the different divisions, for there were seven churches, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven thunders, a seven-headed beast, seven vials and a Sabbath, forming the consummation of the whole. At last the

cyclical arrangement disclosed itself; for it became apparent that the Revelation consisted of different books, each corresponding to one of these cycles, representing one of the seven visions. Each of these sections respectively describes the course or movement of the Christian Church in its earthly progress toward its final consummation, making one of its phases prominent, but beginning the history each time anew from its commencement. The different sections are inter-dependent, like the links of a chain, and form one complete whole. By the discovery of this arrangement, Dr. Lange brought method and order out of uncertainty and confusion. First he found that the Book fell into two halves. The former of these describes the growth and development of the Church, with the course of the world toward its end. The latter, the coming of Christ for the perfecting of His Kingdom, in judgment as well as glory, involving the termination of the present order of things. Dr. Lange makes further subdivisions, according to the requirements of the form and the contents of the Book. In the first cycle—that of the seven churches—we have the Christian Church in its earthly course on to the end of the world, as the ground and centre of the world's history—in other words, the starting-point of the whole movement afterwards to be set forth. The second cycle—that of the seven seals—exhibits universal history proper in the sense of church history—that is, the way in which the Church completes its course in its contact with the world. The third cycle—that of the trumpets—represents the call to repentance on account of the corruption of the Church, as militant, in its progress towards its heavenly goal. In the fourth cycle—the seven thunder voices—we have the sealed awakening periods, the reformations as they occur from time to time in the course of the Church development. The fifth cycle, with its seven-headed beast, mirrors forth the seven world-powers, false Christianity, culminating in Antichrist, the Man of Sin, and persevering in its opposition to the Kingdom of God. The sixth cycle—that of the seven vials—indicates the divine interference in the form of concluding judg-

ments, of which the last includes the one on Babylon, the Beast, and Satan, and ends with the general judgment. Thereupon follows the seventh cycle, as the eternal Sabbath, the Kingdom of glory in the glorified world.

But these cycles need further consideration in order fully to understand the arrangement of the book into its various divisions and subdivisions. In each one of the cycles is to be observed a double representation, an apparent repetition, which requires further explanation. In the case of each, the fulfilment on earth is preceded by an occurrence in Heaven or the spirit-world, which first discloses the divine decree in reference to what is to take place upon the earth. The facts in the case had previously been observed; but Dr. Lange was the first to solve the problem here presented in a satisfactory way.* He

* Ebrard and J. T. Beck, who wrote their commentaries prior to the appearance of that of Lange, express themselves as follows:

"The present period of the interpretation of the Revelation may well be designated as one of general confusion (*Verwirrung*). . . . Indeed all seems more unsettled and confused now than ever. On the one side we find an arbitrary allegoricalism, which takes things to be symbols which are not and cannot be symbols, and on the other a literalism which understands, in the literal sense, things that in the Revelation are treated and explained as symbols (*Bilder*). . . . That school exists only in germinal form, which finds the ground-moments of Church development prophesied thus, which finds neither conjectures nor ideas—neither church-historical passages nor eschatological details in the Apocalypse, but real, true prophecy."—Ebrard, pp. 26, 27.

"The philological and historical apparatus furnishes the striking proof that the *school-learning*, with its mass of contradictory explanations accumulating for years, has only thrown the matter into confusion, and that the key is elsewhere to be sought."—Beck, p. 1.

"That almost every period has its own explanation, does speak against the book. Inasmuch as it claims to be the completing key-stone of prophecy, it must place a peculiar task upon each period, and allow to each a peculiar significance. As the centuries labor at the out-birth of its contents, so must they likewise labor upon its interpretation. No period becomes master of its contents; to each falls only its proper share, but in each case, amid much error, something of the truth. The successive development of the interpretation is two-fold—progress toward understanding, and progress toward fulfilment; perhaps the assertion could be ventured that the commentaries on the Revelation are in their failures and successes at the same time commentaries on the times in which they were written."—Beck, p. 4.

divides each cycle into two parts, namely, into a celestial and earthly representation, of which the former exhibits what takes place in the heavenly spiritual world; the latter, the earthly historical reality.* With this method of resolving the Revelation into divisions, a satisfactory solution of the mystery in which it was involved has been reached; and upon this as a basis will future expositions likely continue to rest, although these too will contribute to a still fuller unfolding of what in it will for an unknown length of time to some remain unrevealed.

A still more difficult question is one which is connected with

* "In its own superior order of existence, the spiritual world has a character of positive reality and substance, which goes immeasurably beyond the visible and tangible show of things in the world of nature. The spiritual world is not the pale shadow of the natural. On the contrary, it is the cause of the natural—that on which it depends—the interior soul of the natural, that from which it draws its continual life—the universal issue and end of the natural—that in which only all its powers and possibilities become complete. It is a world or universe full of concrete existence and sensible experience—full of living relations, activities and powers, full of endlessly diversified phenomenal scenery and surroundings, with which for grandeur, beauty and glory the universe of nature can bear no comparison whatever."—Dr. J. Williamson Nevins. *"Christianity and Humanity."* MEN. REV., Octo., 1878, p. 474.

"That which shall and must take place upon earth, in the evolution of time, proceeds only from that which, as a higher reality, is already present in heaven, and can be shown. Above is already fore-typified all that the future will unfold to us, as the idea of the world and its history was present in God before the foundation of the world. So far as we are carried up thither through the revelation and the showing which removes the veil and reveals the events, so far we know the future reserved from human eye. To ascend into heaven, is in its nature to prophesy for earth.

Let us read and learn, so shall we also see and hear; then will to us also the heavens be opened, and thereby "all things in the invisible world will be shown as present, living, moving action—as far as it belongs to the collective revelation of the Lord Jesus in glory" (as Rieger profoundly and truly expresses himself.) If we open the door of our hearts to the Lord Jesus, as the last Epistle requires, at the close, He will open the door of heaven to each of us according to his capacity and need, and according to the measure of his gift; so that we shall in the general, if not in the specific understanding of him to whom it was shown in Patmos, behold and understand the conflict and victory of the kingdom of God in Christ, and what shall be from this time to the end. Thus the Lord's word gives free permission to the desire of us all to look into His great futurity."—Rudolph Stier on Rev. xxi. 5-8.

the prophetic numbers of the Apocalypse, which owing to senseless and premature calculations have brought discredit on the Book. The prophetic times as well as numbers are not to be understood as having to do with duration of time. Some of the latter have no numerical value at all. The number three refers to the trinity, consequently, signifies holiness, or something else as the context may require. The nearness of the end of the world can never be determined from the numbers and times of Revelation; nor is it their intention to furnish any disclosures of this kind. There are signs of the times which betoken the coming of the Lord, but these consist of events of developing stages and historical formations in the Church and the world. Attention is directed to these as bearing upon the looked-for end. But the Church must expect nothing beyond intimations of this kind. To look for more is a symptom of a spurious Christianity. Our task is comprised in the three Christian virtues of faith, fidelity and patient expectation. We are to *believe* that the Lord will really come; we are to be faithful, so as not to be surprised at His advent; we are to wait, that is, to be on the lookout for the glorious appearance of our Redeemer when He shall finally come to complete His work in the salvation of His people. This implies not calculating by arithmetic, but watching the signs of the times, which distinctly enough indicate that His approach is near at hand.

The present work is intended for members of the Church. Why shall not the laity be made acquainted with the insight into the Apocalypse which has been secured by the labors of many through the course of the ages? The revelation was given by Christ for the Churches, whilst the exposition of it is assigned to the ministerial office. In each period of the Church's history from the beginning, in connection with the plainest promises and threats, God has disclosed as much of its contents as was needful for each. But, unfortunately, the needs of the laity have been overlooked. Work has been done for those who are trained in the sciences; but too little consid-

eration has been shown those for whose special benefit labor of this kind should be performed. Accordingly from this work of mine all scientific refinements are excluded, together with all critical investigations; likewise the weighing of antagonizing views is omitted, as being confusing rather than helpful to the unlearned reader. What the author aims at is not controversy but instruction.

The following is not an entirely new work. To pretend to write one, would be to say that most that hitherto has been written was wrong. It presupposes much that has been accomplished by industry, insight and faith; but upon this basis much had to be done in the way of research, discrimination and further up-building. An almost incredible number of volumes has been written on the subject, representing the greatest variety of views, scarcely one of which, however erroneous the interpretation, failed to contribute something toward a proper understanding of the book.

The most obscure portion of the Revelation is found in the eighth and ninth chapters. Enigmatical though the pictures are, by means of a typical method of interpretation they become intelligible. The key to the explanation is found in the falling torch-like star. This star is no sun, no clear, bright light. It is a torch; light it is true, but not clear and full, but a dull and borrowed light. This torch-like star is human reason, in its independence of God, which apart from God and by its own light pretends to illuminate the world. As wisdom, culture and philosophy, it takes its rise in classical antiquity, thus from heathenism; renewed and strengthened by stolen Christian learning, it reappears in recent centuries. In Christianity there is no room for independent human reason. We have Christian knowledge and science, as the contents of reason, but these do not originate from reason, but from revelation. Reason, as such, like the will, is under the power of sin. How can it be the fountain whence proceeds that pure knowledge which is spiritual light? All science issuing from reason and constructed according to the laws of human thought is de-

fective. The chapters in question exhibit Christianity in the closing stage of its history, as it is, under the influence of human reason, repudiating revelation.* Like devouring locusts,

* "Now, Rev. xi. 8, for the first time the great city is mentioned which afterwards repeatedly occurs under the name of Babylon. Here and there it must be the same city; not here Jerusalem, there Rome. Views of this kind could be held at the time of the composition of the Book and long afterwards; but Christians of the present day should entertain no doubt that the spirit of prophecy here points to a third and still greater one. Another *civitas* is to make its appearance, which will unite in itself all the characteristic features of rebellious Jerusalem and heathen Rome, as well as of the Old Testament, Babylon and Tyre. In it Christ will be spiritually crucified, in it the two witnesses will be slain, just as Peter and Paul died in Rome after they had finished their testimony, and just as in Jerusalem, the martyrdom of James preceded its destruction. It is the Christian Church in its extreme degeneracy. This terrible mystery was sealed for Christian antiquity. When it first dawned upon the minds of Bible-students it was misused to the prejudice of the Roman Church. Not the Roman Church in distinction from the denominations of Protestantism, but Christianity as a whole, the great divine establishment; in so far as it has broken covenant with Christ, comes to be what in the text is called the great Babylon (*wird zur grossen Babylon*).", Thiersch's *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 235.

"There is something true in the doctrine of the Irvingites concerning a great apostasy of the original Church, the 'catastrophe of a second Fall;' but the fanatical error which has caricatured this historical truth, and perverted its meaning into sad extravagances, is plain in the words themselves. Where does the Lord speak of the loss of spiritual gifts, of the disruption of ecclesiastical order, of the abandonment of obedience to official dignities and all those other matters in which these strange people beheld at once the guilt and the punishment of the first Church? The Lord rests His charge upon very different grounds; He rebukes the angel with the Church; He does not merely refer the congregation back to the discipline and form of a forsaken constitution, but to their first love; He does not teach, in the Corinthian manner, the distinguishing value of miraculous gifts, which are not even mentioned here, any more than in the whole Epistle to the Ephesians (although there were such great miracles performed there, there is no mention, even in Chap. iv. 11, of workers of miracles!); He preaches, simply, a renewed REPENTANCE, as in the beginning. This preaching of repentance, indeed, with which Christianity began, as did the Reformation, and which is evermore preached on every relapse of churches or souls, is something very different from those means of grace which, in our days, even Lutherans, like the Irvingites, appoint in the Church as false physicians. Not from without inwardly, and from above downwardly, but from within outwardly, through return to first love, the hurt of souls is healed; this cannot be too diligently remembered, and earnestly enforced." Rudolph Stier, on Rev. ii. 1-7.

human scientific systems rise up with the smoke from the abyss, and at last, like cavalry troops, march and destroy all that comes in their way.

For many members of the Church this book will appear somewhat strange, and thus perhaps somewhat hard to understand. This I trust is ascribable rather to the contents than to the style in which it is written. The manner should not bear the blame, when the matter is unfamiliar. Let the reader *make* the latter familiar by repeated perusal of the book. Then, after a general survey and insight into the connection has been gained, by degrees all becomes intelligible and clear.* The importance of the subject lays this obligation upon every Christian.

What prompted me to write it was the necessity of furnishing members of the Church some insight into the Apocalypse and clearer views concerning the last things and times, of helping to remove the obscurity which veils the people's mind regarding the heavenly world; and of counteracting, by means of a correct view of our times, the all-destructive worldly-mindedness, which is making such terrible inroads both upon our social and ecclesiastical life. That God may richly bless the effort by making it in some measure the means of advancing His Kingdom and promoting His glory is the prayer of

THE AUTHOR.

FOGELSVILLE, PA., May, 1891.

* "Those only suffer the misery of *guessing* as to the meaning of the Apocalypse, who *voluntarily incur it*."—(HENGSTENBERG). Lord Bacon (*Adv. of Learning*, Book II. Sec. III. 8.) tells us he thinks this "misery may be avoided." God's secret will is so obscure as for the most part it is not legible to the natural man,—no, nor many times to those that *behold it from the Tabernacle*."

III.

ST. PAUL AND THE CLASSIC ORATORS.

BY REV. A. R. KREMER, A.M.

MORE than thirty years ago I happened to be at a Dunkard meeting, the first of the kind I ever attended. I was impressed by the patriarchal appearance of the older men, the sober neatness of the women in their plain attire, and the decorous behavior of the young people in the congregation. The simple worship was also impressive, the singing and praying evidently most sincere and earnest.

All this was well calculated to prepare the mind of a stranger for the pastoral instruction that was to follow, and to excite his expectation in regard to it. The praying and singing were good, and it was reasonable to expect a good sermon, or exhortation. In this, however, I was somewhat disappointed. A rather bright-looking and nervous sort of a man, with a sharp, penetrating voice, stood up and read the second chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians; after which a very solemn old gentleman began to speak (as the Spirit gave him utterance, it was supposed) on the Scripture lesson just read. He said it was perfectly plain, according to that Scripture, that Paul and the other apostles were not learned men; were only common men, like himself, with perhaps no more education; knew nothing about "excellency of speech," and depended entirely on the Holy Spirit to teach them what and how to preach. That, spun out in bad English, was the whole bill of fare, so far as the preaching was concerned. The services closed with the beautiful hymn,

"O, for a heart to praise my God,"

and I wondered what those good people would say or think, if they were told that the hymn they sang with so much religious fervor had been composed by a learned man, a graduate of the renowned University of Oxford. It was well for their spiritual peace of mind, perhaps, that they were ignorant of that, as well as of some other things. It may be well to say here that our Dunkard brethren are to-day far removed from such childish ignorance, and that many of them believe in an educated ministry.

And yet there are a good many people whose lot has been cast in Christian denominations having a learned ministry and corresponding conditions who are of opinion that St. Paul here speaks disparagingly of human eloquence and learning. "When I came unto you, I came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the mystery of God." Hence it is that we hear so much about lay preaching and lay evangelism, and schools for the training of men for such work; schools in which only such studies are pursued which are considered of absolute practical necessity for the preacher's work; in which no time is lost in digging for classic roots, or in searching the deep places in science and philosophy; and in which the entire course may be traversed in about the same period that is usually required in a "Business College" or "Commercial Institute." It would not be passing strange if, in time, a new sect would be organized whose priests were graduates of such schools, for already we hear such proclaiming, that they come not with the eloquence and useless learning of the great colleges and seminaries, declaring unto men the pure and simple Gospel of Christ.

But it is sufficient to know that St. Paul's proposition here was, that the wonderful truth and power of the gospel, as set forth in the doctrine of Christ crucified, in no way depended, for accomplishing its design, on the merely human and artificial means that were employed by heathen orators and philosophers to amuse and captivate their hearers. Then, too, it must not be forgotten, that the wisdom of the Greeks, especially at that

time, and their whole theology, rested on fundamental error, and was therefore foolishness with God. And besides, when Paul wrote those words the philosophy and oratory of Greece had greatly declined, both as to substance and form, from their higher conditions in a former age. The Greeks of his day were frivolous, of vitiated literary taste, full of self-conceit, superficial, delighting in high-sounding periods and bombast; and so, of course, they would regard Paul's "presence as weak, and his speech contemptible." Paul feared and trembled when he first addressed the Corinthians in public, not because he regarded himself an inferior among superiors, but because he feared that they in their miserable conceit of wisdom and fine culture would treat his heavenly message with derision, to their infinite loss. St. Paul's whole career affords abundant proof that he never trembled much on his own account when he addressed public assemblies, whether composed of would-be critics, howling mobs, or royalty with its thrones, crowns and awe-inspiring magnificence.

The "excellency of speech," which Paul did not indulge in when he addressed the people of Corinth, was in high favor with them, and he used a strong term in designating it, as if acknowledging that his own diction was poor in comparison. The word rendered "excellency" really means *surpassing excellence*—*ὑπεροχὴν*; and yet the well instructed part of his Christian readers of Corinth would now understand it as indicating a striking contrast between the meretricious eloquence of the Greeks of that day and the pure and simple presentation of divine truth by the apostle. So his grand aim in speaking could be seen to be, not *ὑπεροχὴ τοῦ λόγου*, and the pleasing of the natural man, but, the triumph of the truth as it is in Jesus, resulting in the salvation of his hearers. Both the substance and the form of Paul's addresses, or sermons, fell far below the standard of what the Greeks of the period so much admired, and yet they accomplished their high purpose, that of raising men up to the highest plane of well being and dignity. And in that age of literary and philosophic decline—if only

the Greeks had known it—there arose, in the person and literary productions of St. Paul, a new era in the realm of thought, speech, letters and wisdom. This new and strange man came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, according to the Greek's highest conception of it at that period, and yet with an excellency of speech and of wisdom that would begin forthwith to overshadow the most brilliant productions of the Greek mind of all previous ages.

If we then take Paul's statement about "excellency of speech" in a purely literal sense, and descriptive, without qualification, of his speaking and writing in general, it must be said that his literary productions, especially certain portions of them, including this very chapter in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, disprove his assertion. But Paul knew what he was saying, and spoke the truth; for he did not speak at all of his own idea of what constituted excellency of speech. He has, however, given us some very fine specimens of it. In this very Epistle, in which he seems to place a low estimate on eloquence, there are passages that would probably have delighted and thrilled the old Greek masters, if they could have seen and read them. What would such grand and solid men like Aristotle, Socrates, Plato and Cicero have thought of the second, twelfth, thirteenth and fifteenth chapters of this Epistle? What would those logicians and intellectual giants have thought of the logical and argumentative Epistle to the Romans, or of that wonderful literary gem, the Epistle to the Ephesians, of which Grotius has remarked, that "it expresses the grand matters of which it treats in words more sublime than are to be found in any human tongue?" They could not have sounded their spiritual depths, being uninstructed in the Christian mysteries, but they surely would have recognized in them some wondrous power, beauty and literary excellence surprising even to themselves and surpassing their own high standards. Allowing here for honest and learned difference of opinion, it may be safely asserted that the Epistle to the Hebrews (which is Paul's, even if he did not write it himself) may at least be placed side

by side, as a literary production, with the best Greek classics. If any of those great masters ever wrote anything superior to the opening chapter of Hebrews, let it be produced. Indeed there are scores of passages, and whole chapters, in Paul's epistles, which, had they been found scattered through the works of the great authors of Greece, would have been lauded as gems of thought and rhetorical beauty. It may be the fashion to compare unfavorably *all* the New Testament writings with the Greek classics, but fashion is not always on the side of truth. It is really amusing to hear men "with small Latin and less Greek" descant on "the servant form" of the New Testament original, as if its relation to Attic purity were about the same as Pennsylvania Dutch is to the elegant diction of Berlin or Heidelberg, or as the vulgar *Bas Breton* to the polished language of the French Academy. It is all a mistake. Any good English scholar, unacquainted with Greek, would pronounce the writings of Paul, at least large portions of them, beautiful and eloquent; and if literal English translations of them are such, the same must be true of them in their original form.

It is quite unnecessary to affirm what is generally known, that St. Paul was familiar with the literature and philosophy of the Greeks; and he made constant use of that knowledge, being the apostle in particular to that part of the Gentile world.

But while there may be no dispute in regard to this,—for we have his writings and other testimonies,—still it was said by some in his time that, while his letters were weighty and powerful, he was an indifferent orator. But here again we must suppose, for good reason, that his critics were at fault. We have some specimens of his oratorical productions, and we know what was their effect upon his hearers. The Lycaonians were moved by his eloquence to call him Mercury and to offer him divine honors. Then, with the same power of eloquence, he restrained the multitude, headed by the priest of Jupiter, from doing sacrifice to him and Barnabas. His speech would have done honor to the old masters of the divine art: "Sirs,

why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and bring you good tidings, that ye should turn from these vain things unto the living God, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that in them is; who in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways. And yet he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness." We know the result: the enthusiastic multitude, excited to fever heat and rushing with oxen and garlands to their temple to sacrifice to the gods who, they supposed, had come down to them in human form, swayed back and dispersed, as obedient as a well-trained army to the command of a general. His speech before Agrippa, if all other proofs were insufficient, alone proves him an orator of classic eloquence. His address to the Athenians delivered on Mars' Hill, even the fragment that we have of it, is a piece of eloquence which the most illustrious Greek might have been proud of. His apt reference to the poet Aratus showed his oratorical readiness and wisdom, as well as indicated his knowledge of the best Greek classics. For, concerning the high character of that poet, we need no better testimony than the line of Ovid: "*Oum sole et Luna semper Aratus erit.*" Paul showed his familiarity with Greek literature equally well in the Epistle to Titus 1: 12: "*Κριτες δει φευσαι, κακα θηρια, γαστρις ἀραι,*" which he quoted from the poet Epimenides. So, too, his very frequent allusions to Grecian history, philosophy and religion are sufficient to show his Grecian culture, and that he was not a stranger to classic genius and its great achievements.

It appears plain enough that St. Paul's presentation of gospel truth, whether by oral speech or by letter, did not differ materially in form or style from that of the classic speakers and writers of Greece and Rome. Paul did not represent oratory and letters in their decline, as in the period in which he lived; he was a true representative of a former golden age,—the age of Isocrates, Æschines, and the greatest of all, Demos-

thenes. It may be safely asserted that Paul admired those great masters of eloquence, and felt himself much indebted to them. His themes were, of course, immeasurably greater than theirs; but he and they had in view a common object or result; that is, to instruct and convince men and move them to action. Paul scarcely concealed his contempt for the tawdry eloquence among the Greeks of his day, and his declaration concerning "excellency of speech" has the appearance of keen irony when viewed in the light of the Pauline eloquence,—the eloquence of Demosthenes adapted and applied to what he (with another bit of sacred irony) called the "foolishness of preaching" Christ and Him crucified.

It may be asserted as an axiom, that there was not one kind of true eloquence for the pagan Greek and another for the Christian. St. Paul had not only been a student of sacred things in the school of Gamaliel, and in the school of Christ; he had also diligently studied the humanities and arts of the Greek civilization, as being a true part of liberal learning and culture. He is the personal argument in favor of that mental training for the Christian ministry which the Church has always prescribed; very different indeed from the "excellency of speech and of wisdom," so highly estimated by the conceited sophists and shallow pretenders of Corinth; on the contrary, an education that is solid and rational, as well as beautiful and ornamental. In St. Paul, Demosthenic eloquence was born again, was clothed in new and heavenly garments, and became instrumental in the glorious work of converting the world to Christ.

We have only to study carefully the old masters of oratory and letters, to be convinced that the great Apostle, Christ's special and chief instrument in founding the Church on heathen soil, could by no means ignore and despise their productions. Indeed the history of the Church has shown unmistakably that these have been pictures of silver containing the apples of gold. St. Paul seems to have been specially chosen to utilize the rich stores of intellectual wealth, furnished by the Greek masters,

in the interest of Christianity. While on the one hand he boldly declares that the gospel of Christ is the power and wisdom of God without the aid of the world's wisdom and fine speech, he nevertheless employs the choicest and best which the world possesses, for the conveyance of God's saving grace to men. As a Christian orator he was undoubtedly a debtor to the great orators of Greece and Rome. St. Paul was all the better and more efficient as an apostle, because of there having been a Demosthenes. No doubt that in his youth, his mind was often aglow over the orations against Philip. We may imagine how his intellectual fire burned and flamed, as he pored upon the marvellous speech, "On the Crown," and how his soul was stirred, as with his mental ear he listened to the peals of thunder as they came crashing from the lips of the orator. It almost seems as if St. Paul borrowed his thunder from Demosthenes, when, in his defence before the Jewish council, he said to the high priest, no doubt in a tone, as in words, of righteous indignation: "God shall smite *thee*, thou whited wall: and sittest thou to judge me according to the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" And when he denounced Elymas the sorcerer: "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness!" How like the great Athenian orator in his terrible hail-storm of invective, which he rained down upon his persecutor. Referring to a certain epitaph which he had just recited, he said: "Æschines! hearest thou all that? . . . Why, then, O most depraved and polluted wretch! hast thou piled up against me such false accusations? Why hast thou denounced against me what is thy most special due, and which I pray the gods to pour out in all their wrath upon thee and thy vile confederates?" The great Athenian had not lived in vain; he and others of his kind, had contributed much to the glory of Christ's kingdom. They were girded by the Lord, though they did not know Him. In after ages, in the fulness of the time, when their own nation would prove unworthy of them, God would raise up a son of Abraham, in the Greek city of Tarsus,

and endow him with the best gifts of the world's literary capital in her palmiest days. This Hebrew of the Hebrews will rescue the rich treasures of the Greek mind from out of the gathered rubbish of centuries, and deposit them in the Church for the use of her children, until the time when such "Knowledge shall be done away."

Not more than half a century, perhaps, before Paul's birth, Cicero, the most distinguished of the Roman orators, was governor of the province of Cilicia. This was the Apostle's native country; and here as a free-born Roman citizen he received that classic training and education which stood him in such good stead in after years, and became, under God, such a blessing to the world. We may feel quite certain that such a diligent student as Paul would not miss reading the works of Cicero, the most learned of the Romans, surely the greatest of their orators. We know how greatly Paul desired to see Rome, and no doubt it was partly at least on account of his knowledge of the historical men and facts of that renowned capital of the world. He had been undoubtedly well instructed in Roman history, and he must have been thoroughly familiar with the life and works of Cicero, for he certainly knew the history of his own native province. The study of Cicero's orations must have been no small part of Paul's early training. No doubt he felt like all enthusiastic students feel when he read the orations against Catiline. And the Latin being still a living language, we may imagine him in the school-room on declamation day playing first consul and pointing his finger toward some fellow-student exclaiming: "*Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? . . . O tempora! O mores! . . . Nos, nos, dico aperte, nos consules, desumus!*"

We know that Paul was wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove. He did not learn that from the gospel alone. He was "all things to all men," in a proper sense, and what lessons he could learn from Cicero of this kind we may know from the character and the orations of the great Roman himself. Of course he did not copy entire and without modification this or

any other characteristic of the learned heathen. He possessed himself of the good only, sifted of all dross of human error and sin. Yet there seems to be much in Paul that he learned from this and others of the classic authors. The fine Pauline moral discrimination is Ciceronian, no less than Aristotelian and Platonic. His theology was from God; much of the form in which he presented it for people's instruction was from men, the most cultured men of the heathen world.

Did Paul ever read Cicero's oration, "*Pro Marcello*?" It is much more than likely he did. The art of conciliating power, (as embodied, in this instance, in the almost omnipotent Cæsar) by the masterly use of eloquence, is here remarkably illustrated. That brilliant oratorical effort could scarcely have escaped Paul's notice. We may take it for granted that he was familiar with it, and that its study contributed to his own successful efforts on somewhat similar occasions, notably at Cæsarea, when he spoke like a god before royalty and compelled the representatives of earthly authority to do him reverence, though he was their prisoner in chains. There is plainly a classic side to St. Paul's intellectual make-up. He was influenced, perhaps unconsciously, as a speaker and writer, by the master-pieces of Greece and Rome. It is true, he counted all such learning and culture as worthless in comparison with the Gospel of Christ and the knowledge of it; but only *in comparison* with it. What was true and good in the Greek classics he used in the service of his divine Master. A true orator like Demosthenes was a worthy example to be followed even by a Christian apostle.

The sophisms and oratorical juggleries, of which there was abundance, he despised. He set at naught and denounced the religion of the Greeks by using against it their own best weapons of oratory and philosophy. He employed their own religious terms in teaching and defending Christianity. And, finally, he made the bold claim that everything of which the Greek had a right to be proud, as well as everything in Judaism worth preserving, belonged by clear right and title to the Christian Church and to every Christian man: "*All things are yours.*"

The legal learning of Rome; the vast attainments of the Greeks in all that pertains to the highest civilization the world had ever seen; and the glorious revelation from God to His ancient people—"All are yours."

Thus the greatest of all the servants of Christ on earth—the most learned and successful of the apostles—gathered up in himself and appropriated for holy uses the best elements of the Greek and Roman classics. These he used as implements of war against the enemies of Christ and His Church, and as media in the peaceful work of pouring into the hearts of men the light of the blessed gospel. Viewed simply as a Christian apostle, on the same plane as the other apostles, without reference to his peculiar intellectual attainments (if it were possible thus to view him without losing sight of him altogether), then one whole side of his personality would be wanting, and we would not have the Paul that we now have. If his repudiation of "excellency of speech and of wisdom," meant a total casting aside as worthless of all his high attainments in Grecian lore, then the Paul of the New Testament is scarcely a respectable myth, or rather, has no existence at all. On the contrary, he is the one mighty man of learning—the man eloquent—whom God raised up as a necessary factor in the work of completing the foundation of the apostolic Church; for the twelve pillars of the living temple that were consecrated by the Spirit and placed in position on the Day of Pentecost, needed yet this one to complete the structure, as the representative of the Greek world and the Christian culture of all succeeding ages.

It is quite true that a distinction is to be made between sacred and secular oratory; but chiefly because of the difference of subjects, the substance of the one being so vastly different from and so much more important than the other. The principles and fundamental characteristics in both are still very much the same. This will appear plain enough when we study the best of the Greek and Roman masters of the art. Not all were vain sophists, or men whose chief ambition was to gain

reputation and applause; or special pleaders, whose sole object it was to gain their cause, whether right or wrong. The orators who were deserving of the name were men of truth and profound convictions, and were moved by a sense of duty to do what they could to produce the same convictions and sense of right in their hearers which they themselves possessed. We cannot read Demosthenes' fiery Philippics, or his great oration "On the Crown" without feeling that he was borne along by the power of truth, as he honestly apprehended it, rather than by visions of the glory that he may have anticipated as the reward of his oratorical efforts.

From such a man St. Paul could learn much as to the conditions of success in public speaking. He was well supplied with the wisdom of God, of which the greatest of the Greeks were ignorant, and yet if that wisdom or truth was to be made known by him to others, it must be done through the medium of language, spoken and written. Then the question would be as to the language itself, the method of delivery, and even the bodily action in connection with the oral transmission of the words as vehicles of his thought. He did say that his preaching was not with "enticing words of man's wisdom;" then, with what kind of words? Surely not with the words or in the rude style of a barbarian, or common rustic, as we know from his writings and his few recorded speeches. No, his speech was ordered according to the best rules of rhetoric and logic and the principles of oratory, as discovered in the teaching and examples of the best masters.

Only think for a moment, if Demosthenes' oration on "The Crown" would have had for its subject, "The Crown of Righteousness"—that is, if he had been acquainted with the truths of Christianity, and he were pleading for the crowning or canonization, of some Christian hero, in which he was opposed for some reason by another Christian orator, Æschines, for example; suppose his hero, whom it was proposed to honor, had done for Christ and His Church what the crowned Greek had done for his country; instead of Philip, suppose it was some

powerful spiritual enemy that he had sought to conquer, for the peace of the Church and the glory of Christ ; then employ the language of that immortal oration (with such necessary alterations as the case demands) in the praise of Christian heroism, as exemplified in the glorious deeds of a valiant Christian leader, and we may well imagine its lofty place among the Christian classics. Then with such an oratorical performance we may compare the dying speech of the great apostle—unequalled, however, by the greatest of uninspired utterances—in which he asserts the Christian believer's right to a crown in language that will live forever, and more eloquent than Demosthenes' best : " I have fought a good fight," etc. What a rising, step by step, up to the very throne of the Eternal ! Here,

" Still rising in a climax, till the last,
Surpassing all, is not to be surpassed,"

by the most sublime flights of Grecian oratory. Yet it was itself Grecian, and no mistake. The martial spirit so conspicuous here and elsewhere in Paul's writings has all the glow and rhetoric of Demosthenes' heroic utterances, whose patriotism the Apostle transferred to the everlasting commonwealth of the saints, as when he said : " Our citizenship is in heaven ; " " Ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ; " therefore, " Fight the good fight of faith," fight for your country—" Put on the whole armor of God ; " " Stand against the wiles of the devil," and many other expressions adapted from patriotic Greek eloquence. In St. Paul classic eloquence is risen from the dead and glorified by the mind and Spirit of Christ ; and Demosthenes' oration, " *De Corona*," the greatest, perhaps, that ever fell from uninspired lips, was the forerunner and type of the great Christian utterance on the crown by the eloquent Apostle.

As at Corinth, in St. Paul's day, so now, there is much that passes for pulpit eloquence, but which bears no likeness to the ancient classic, or Pauline. There is also that which does ap-

proach this high standard. The difference between them is the same as that between the rant of a shallow declaimer (whose whole outfit is cheap learning and a glib tongue) and the direct, solid and convincing presentation of divine truth by one whose mind and heart are in fellowship with the Divine. There are preachers quite too many who have gained a wide notoriety by certain pyrotechnic displays in the pulpit, but are not known as possessing any of the great qualities that convert sinners or edify saints. Crowds go to hear them—for about the same reason that the idle loungers of Athens flocked to Mars' Hill to hear what Paul had to say concerning the "strange gods," of which "he seemed to be a setter forth"—and return from the feast of husks unfed, deceived and mocked. Better for the true preacher, like Paul, to be mocked by his hearers than that they should be mocked by the preacher. When Demosthenes had concluded any one of his powerful orations against the enemy of his country, the vast assembly of Greeks used to make the Areopagus tremble on its rocky foundations with their shout: "Let us fight against Philip! Let us conquer or die!" but the crowds that are entertained by certain popular preachers go away in anything but a fighting mood, and with no thought of making any sacrifice for Christ. We plead for pulpit eloquence, but not for the vain and weak stage performances of clerical actors. If the choice must be between *such* "excellency of speech and wisdom," and the kind of preaching referred to at the beginning of this article, then let us have that rustic simplicity with all its narrowness and ignorance. But there is no such alternative as that. Let the highest eloquence be sought; it is divine, and truly human; rightly used, it is more powerful for good than words can express; it is an instrument of the Lord that has executed some of His greatest designs in the world, in every age of its history. The oratory that inspired the Greeks with high moral sentiments and aroused them to patriotic action; that relieved Rome of deadly conspiracy, saved the state, and called forth the deep gratitude of the nation, as expressed in the gift of "*Pater Patriæ*" to the orator; that

spread the kingdom of truth and righteousness among men, broke down false religions, made moral heroes and an army of Christian martyrs; such is the oratory, classic and Pauline, that is needed, now and always, in every city and town, in every village and hamlet.

What has now been said is intended as a plea for what is most needed in the pulpit, and that is, *power*. It is easy to see that the chief outward conditions of such power in St. Paul's case were his educational accomplishments. These he wholly consecrated to the service of God. And without such consecration the highest mental attainments are powerless in the pulpit. They are mere ciphers, if standing alone and not supplemented and perfected by the one thing needful—the possession by the preacher of “the mind of Christ.” There is an infinite difference between mere formal oratory and that which is filled with the earnestness of Christian faith and love. “If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal.” In another place St. Paul tells the same truth, the secret of pulpit power: “We have the mind of Christ.” Pulpit power exists only where the man of God is thoroughly furnished with the implements of heaven and earth, knows how to use them, is faithful in the service of his divine Master, covets the best gifts—and glories only in the cross.

We make the following observations on this subject:

1. One great reason why St. Paul was the greatest and most successful of all the apostles was, that he excelled as an orator. This implied that he possessed the *requisites* of a true orator. Cicero, in “*De Oratore*,” puts into the mouth of Crassus this general proposition: That an almost universal knowledge in science and literature is necessary to perfection in oratory. This was evidently Cicero's own opinion, as it is understood that “Crassus” in the dialogue represented his views. It is well known that Cicero's studies embraced the whole field of knowledge; hence the great variety of themes on which he spoke and wrote. His works show that he was a living cyclo-

pædia of learning; and this fact is undoubtedly one of the secrets of his great power as an orator. It is certainly true that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." St. Paul was to the Church what Demosthenes and Cicero were to Greece and Rome. Like Moses, he was learned in all the wisdom of his age. And we may be sure he did not fail to study the art of public speaking. So that with his mind stored with knowledge, and having special gifts of eloquence, he stands before the world as one of its best representatives of the divine art, divine in the new and added sense that, in his case, it was sanctified and illuminated by the Spirit of God. St. Paul as an orator not only preached the gospel, but he also presented its sacred truths in such manner as to be best understood, make the most abiding impression on mind and heart, and thus move the will and convert the soul.

2. All this, however, has in itself no power to effect God's gracious purposes in men's behalf. The saving virtue of the gospel is the divine grace which it promises. That grace alone bringeth salvation; and all of which we have been speaking, as pertaining to oratory, can only be, at best, the most effectual means of breaking down and through the barriers that are in the way of God's saving grace reaching and penetrating the souls of men. But that is indeed much, and in every way worthy of the preacher's most diligent effort. It is the duty of God's ministers to use the very best means, in the pulpit and everywhere, that will accomplish the object of their high commission from the Lord.

3. Let it be carefully observed, that the eloquence which is common to pagan and Christian, does not appear with *undue prominence* in St. Paul. The Christian mind is struck first and chiefly with the great and solemn truths that he uttered. The form and style have much to do with the effect produced on mind and heart, yet the chief thing is the substance contained in the form, and the great object was to convey that substance to men for their spiritual benefit. True to the word of Christ, that, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation," the

great Apostle kept in the back-ground everything that might withdraw the attention from Christian virtue and the solemn concerns of the life to come. Therefore, as any one may see, there is not manifest in the most eloquent of his writings, or addresses, the least effort or design to produce a thrill of momentary delight. Nor is there the slightest indication of pride of learning. His pride was in something else: he gloried only in the cross. He determined not to know anything, among Jews and Gentiles, learned and unlearned, except Christ and Him crucified. That glorious theme he indeed expanded and illustrated in language unsurpassed for excellence by "the tongues of men and of angels," yet he did not thereby furnish flowers without fruit, and conceal the Central Object in clouds of rhetoric. All that he possessed in spirit, soul and body, he laid upon the altar of Christ. It was his "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God," and in full accord with his exhortation to all Christians: "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." And though he was the greatest of God's servants, the mightiest of all the heroes and princes in Messiah's kingdom, yet his own estimate of himself he expressed in the words: "I am the least of the apostles." He was as eloquent as Demosthenes, even as judged according to the world's standard, and yet he was perfectly willing, for the gospel's sake, to be regarded as a mere "babbling," his only concern being that his words of truth might enter into the souls of at least *some* of his hearers and give the light of salvation. And this entire self-consecration to the service of God, his freedom from worldly ambition and his self-abnegation, instead of detracting from him as an orator, added immeasurably to his quality in that regard. For, the best orators are not those who are habitually conscious of their ability as such, and who make eloquence their special aim. The best and most successful pulpit orators, are those who speak not for time, but for eternity; not to tickle the ears of men, but to please the ear of God. Such was St. Paul. Such was the eloquent Massillon, whether addressing an ordinary congrega-

tion, or one composed of King Louis *Le Grand*, his court and dignitaries of Church and state; so that the proud monarch was constrained on one occasion to say to the intrepid preacher: "I have heard many great orators, and been satisfied with them; but when you spoke I was very dissatisfied with myself." Let preachers take note of this.

4. We have here, finally, the most complete authority for the training of candidates for the Christian ministry, as this has always prevailed in the historical Church. The Greek and Latin classics have always been regarded as important studies in a preparation for the study of theology. Besides, secular learning in its widest scope, including the arts and sciences, should be part of the preacher's general equipment. Then theology, chief of all, all else being as scaffolding, helps, hand-maids, servants. The life of St. Paul leaves no doubt as to what the Christian ministry should be in this respect. And in the present age, perhaps more than in any other in the past, a thoroughly educated ministry is imperatively demanded and needed. The pulpit to-day needs Pauline eloquence and power. And they who diligently and in true apostolic and catholic spirit, pursue their preparation with such result in view will scarcely fail to secure it in sufficient degree.

Verbum ad sapientes: Let no candidate for the Christian ministry vex his soul concerning place or position, or imagine that there is any place on earth where there are human beings that is not good enough for him and for the exercise of his talents, however great and splendid these may be. St. Paul was glad to preach the gospel anywhere and to any people,—whether at Lystra, where the brutal populace stoned him till he was thought to be dead; in the house of Lydia, the dealer in purple; in Philippi, where the "best society" in his congregation were the jailer and his family; in Thessalonica and Berea, where his success stirred up the rage and jealousy of Jews and Gentiles against him, and he had to flee for his life; at Corinth, where his preaching, rhetoric and Greek were ridiculed by lofty pretenders, and at scores of other places where

he was shamefully treated and persecuted; at the Areopagus, where he stood on the pulpit from which Demosthenes and others of immortal fame had spoken, and proclaimed the "Unknown God" and His Incarnate Son to the most refined and cultured men of Athens; at Jerusalem, to the assembled priests and doctors boiling over with rage against him, the pliant multitude ready at their word to tear him in pieces; or at the world's capital, in his own hired house, "teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness," within the prison walls to all who approached him, and in the palace of the Emperor. No matter where or to whom, Paul was always happy of the opportunity to deliver the gospel message. A Christian minister of that stamp, thoroughly trained for his work and wholly consecrated to God, will warm into the genuine eloquence that is more than a human art, and that will in due time transform a human wilderness into a garden of the Lord. Let every candidate for the Christian ministry discipline and try himself by the great Apostle's example, and by his most reasonable challenge and test: "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."

tion, or one composed of King Louis *Le Grand*, his court and dignitaries of Church and state; so that the proud monarch was constrained on one occasion to say to the intrepid preacher: "I have heard many great orators, and been satisfied with them; but when you spoke I was very dissatisfied with myself." Let preachers take note of this.

4. We have here, finally, the most complete authority for the training of candidates for the Christian ministry, as this has always prevailed in the historical Church. The Greek and Latin classics have always been regarded as important studies in a preparation for the study of theology. Besides, secular learning in its widest scope, including the arts and sciences, should be part of the preacher's general equipment. Then theology, chief of all, all else being as scaffolding, helps, hand-maids, servants. The life of St. Paul leaves no doubt as to what the Christian ministry should be in this respect. And in the present age, perhaps more than in any other in the past, a thoroughly educated ministry is imperatively demanded and needed. The pulpit to-day needs Pauline eloquence and power. And they who diligently and in true apostolic and catholic spirit, pursue their preparation with such result in view will scarcely fail to secure it in sufficient degree.

Verbum ad sapientes: Let no candidate for the Christian ministry vex his soul concerning place or position, or imagine that there is any place on earth where there are human beings that is not good enough for him and for the exercise of his talents, however great and splendid these may be. St. Paul was glad to preach the gospel anywhere and to any people,—whether at Lystra, where the brutal populace stoned him till he was thought to be dead; in the house of Lydia, the dealer in purple; in Philippi, where the "best society" in his congregation were the jailer and his family; in Thessalonica and Berea, where his success stirred up the rage and jealousy of Jews and Gentiles against him, and he had to flee for his life; at Corinth, where his preaching, rhetoric and Greek were ridiculed by lofty pretenders, and at scores of other places where

he was shamefully treated and persecuted; at the Areopagus, where he stood on the pulpit from which Demosthenes and others of immortal fame had spoken, and proclaimed the "Unknown God" and His Incarnate Son to the most refined and cultured men of Athens; at Jerusalem, to the assembled priests and doctors boiling over with rage against him, the pliant multitude ready at their word to tear him in pieces; or at the world's capital, in his own hired house, "teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness," within the prison walls to all who approached him, and in the palace of the Emperor. No matter where or to whom, Paul was always happy of the opportunity to deliver the gospel message. A Christian minister of that stamp, thoroughly trained for his work and wholly consecrated to God, will warm into the genuine eloquence that is more than a human art, and that will in due time transform a human wilderness into a garden of the Lord. Let every candidate for the Christian ministry discipline and try himself by the great Apostle's example, and by his most reasonable challenge and test: "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."

IV.

THE PERSONALITY AND OFFICE OF GOD THE FATHER.

BY REV. J. W. LOVE, A.M.

THAT there is a Supreme Being, whether the God of the Bible, or some other, is not only very generally conceded, by both Christian and pagan peoples, but is also a very part of man's innate consciousness. While here and there an individual may be found, who, from wilful blindness of mind and hardness of heart, can deny the existence of a personal God, there is no race of people, or even tribe of any nationality that does not believe in and worship some form of Deity. In the history of mankind there are comparatively few atheists known, and of those who profess atheism, it may be doubted whether many, if any of them have been able to crush out of their hearts the feeling, that, after all, there is a God be He Jehovah, Buddha, Mishna, or "The Unknown God."

To attempt to prove the existence of God, especially to any civilized and enlightened people, it seems to me, would be like an attempt to prove our own existence, and the existence of the world around us—an act of sheer folly. I do not believe that the Word of God, which Christians recognize as His divine revelation, anywhere warrants us in attempts to *prove* any of its profound truths, by a process of reasoning outside of its own declarations, or even to do so from God's first revelation—the book of nature. Ministers are commissioned and ordained to *preach* and *teach* the divine truth, not to prove it independently of what the Word itself teaches. The truth, if simply preached or taught, will always find a response in the needs of man, and

authenticate itself to his inner consciousness, if he is really a seeker after truth.

The God of the Bible addresses Himself both to our reason and our faith. The one is never really in conflict with the other. Opinions may greatly differ, and all sorts of absurd notions may be mistaken for the contents of faith, but true faith, which is the gift of God, will always be in fullest harmony with true reason. It does accept and appropriate that which is *above reason*, or which cannot be fathomed by the finite mind, but it is never contrary to reason. An intelligent faith is always in harmony with reason, though not necessarily one that understands all hidden or revealed truth.

In discussing the subject, I do not therefore feel called upon to *prove* the personality of God the Father, or to treat of His office outside of what we are plainly taught in His Word, and of what has been found true in human experience. Whatever uses speculative theology may have, it is not a divinely authorized agency for saving, or even for comforting sin-distressed souls. The same is true of all forms of philosophy, and of scientific teaching, not based upon or properly a part of God's inspired revelation, which we call the Bible.

Why, then, do we believe in the personality and office of God the Father, as distinct from the personalities and offices of God the Son, and of God the Holy Ghost? *I answer, simply because we are so taught* in the inspired Word. It would take me beyond the limits of this article to argue at any length the well-established doctrine of the Trinity. It will suffice to say, (as is well known,) that the prominent teachers in all branches of the orthodox Christian Church, from the apostolic fathers, down to the present, have interpreted divine revelation as teaching both the Unity and Trinity of the Godhead. The Old Testament emphasized more especially, it is true, the Unity of God, because the tendency in Old Testament times was to polytheism. But the germ of the doctrine of the Trinity is clearly found in the teachings of patriarchs, prophets, poets and historians of the old dispensation. The very name of God—*Elohim*,

—which is plural—and the account given of conferences held by the persons of the Godhead in reference to the creation and redemption of man, even long before He was created, show plainly, especially in the light of New Testament teaching, that, while the Deity is one, there was already in the counsels of Eternity a varied manifestation of later and fuller trinitarian revelation. The personality of an omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent God and Father, was in fact a fundamental doctrine of the Jewish religion from the first, and continues to be such, to the present day. It is admitted that the doctrine of the Trinity, as held and taught in the Christian Church, is a fuller development of personality in Deity, but it is in no sense contradictory to the revealed truth given the Jew for his guidance, comfort, and instruction. That Jesus, and the authors of the New Testament all teach the personality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, seems to be as plain as language can make it.

To quote passages would be superfluous to readers of this REVIEW. It was so clear to the mind of the apostolic and primitive Church fathers, that it was not even thought necessary to treat of it in a technical sense. It was only after it began to be perverted and misconstrued by false teachers, that the Church felt called upon to formulate, and carefully word trinitarian creeds—especially the one known as the Nicene creed. It might be interesting, but space forbids, to treat at length of the great trinitarian controversy, that culminated in the clear expression of saving, comforting truth as contained in the creed referred to, adopted by the Council of Nice, A. D., 325.

We may only add, that so thoroughly was the trinitarian question settled by the Nicene fathers, that there has been but little room for controversy, in regard to it, since their day. Accordingly to-day the personality of the Father, with that of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, stands as an impregnable bulwark of our Holy Christianity, against the puny efforts of Unitarians, and all other unbelievers, to overthrow it.

We hasten to speak of the office of God the Father, as distinct from that of the other persons of the Holy Trinity. What then

is the office of God the Father? I reply, its meaning and purpose is set forth in the word *Father*. True, this word is used in a general, as well as in a particular, sense. When used to designate the first person of the trinity, it expresses His relation to His Son, Jesus Christ, and, through Him, the relation He sustains to all creation—especially to those who are adopted sons and daughters in Christ. But the word *Father* is also used to designate the relation of the Deity as such, or of the whole divine essence, to creation, and the world of mankind. In this general sense, it applies to the other persons of the Godhead also; as in the Lord's prayer—"Our Father," etc., and when Jesus is called "the everlasting Father." Isa., ix. 6.

As already intimated, the usual and most frequent use of the word *Father* applies to the first person of the Holy Trinity. He is the *eternal* Father of the *eternally* begotten Son, from whom, and the Son, proceeds the Holy Ghost. He is also *in the Son*, in virtue of our regeneration by the Holy Ghost, *our Father* in the fullest truest sense. Even as "Creator, Preserver, and bountiful Benefactor," He is our eternal Father, but He is especially such in redemption, as we shall see farther on.

The name *Father* does not merely indicate a temporal relationship. It means infinitely more than is expressed by His relationship, as its creator, to the universe over which He rules, and which is the object of His providential care. He always was Father, as truly as He was and is God; and it is only in this paternal relation to Christ, that He could and did become the author and source of temporal creation. This is clearly taught by the apostle John in his wonderful prologue to his gospel, when he says: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, (or as it is in the margin of the revised version 'through Him,') and without Him was not anything made that was made." So also the declaration repeatedly made in the Epistles of St. Paul, as in Eph. 3: 9, Col. 1: 16, Heb. 1: 2, and again by St. John, in Rev. 4: 11, that it was by or through the Lord Jesus, that God the Father cre-

ated all things, cannot mean anything else than that His Fatherhood, as exercised in and through His Son, is co-eternal with the Godhead itself.

There are also passages in the Old Testament Scriptures which teach the same great truth—I say *great* truth; because it is a fundamental conception of any true idea of God. The figurative mode of expression by Moses, representing the *generations* of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 2: 1,) as proceeding from God; and of the book of Job, asking; “Hath the rain a father, or who hath begotten the drops of dew,” (Job 38: 28.) As also New Testament expressions, such as, “the Father of Lights,” and, “to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things,” (Jas. 1: 17 and 1 Cor. 8: 6) are evidently intended to set forth the relation of the first person of the Trinity, as the creator of all mundane things; and, (taken in connection with those passages which teach the paternal relation of the Father and the Son, and, through Him, the work of creation), leave no room to doubt the *eternal* paternity of the first person of the triune God. Thus it is the eternal Father of the eternal Son, by, or through the eternal Son, who is the eternal Creator of all things visible and invisible on earth and in heaven; yea, in the entire universe of God.

It is further in the exercise of the fatherhood of God, that, through His immanence, as well as His transcendence, the universe is upheld, all natural and moral law is maintained, and the eternal purposes of creation are attained. Thus we have the general and the special, (or, if you prefer it, the particular) providences of God the Father in the government of the universe. It is not necessary to quote even a few of the passages sustaining this view; the word of God is full of them, from Genesis to Revelation. If the Scriptures teach anything in reference to God the Father, it is that His office is exercised in the whole work of creation, preservation, and loving care of all things that exist in His universe. To repeat, then, the idea of a personal God, necessitates the Fatherhood of God as from all eternity, in and through His eternally begotten Son, by whom,

or through whom, all things have been created, are governed and upheld, for a definitely fixed purpose, which is His own glory and the highest good of His rational creatures.

It follows, therefore, that in this office, God, the Father stands related to all creation, and especially that portion of it endowed with intelligence, as "creator, preserver and bountiful benefactor," since all this is involved in the very name—Father.

But we may rise to a still higher plane in considering the office of the first person of the Holy Trinity. *He is the Supreme Law-giver for the regulation of our thinking, morals and entire life.*

Man in his fallen unregenerate state is prone to imagine that he may determine his own thinking; that he is free to regulate his own morals, and that he is the arbiter of his own destiny; in other words; that he is "a law unto himself." The Bible teaches differently. It informs man that he is in a mentally and morally sin-darkened state, that he has no power to think or act for his own best welfare, and that he is the slave of the destroying forces we call sin and Satan. He is further taught of the giving of a divine law; first in his moral constitution, afterward (when he had destroyed this) by outward promulgation on Mt. Sinai, for his mental, moral, and physical government. This divine law is not arbitrary. It is given for man's highest welfare as well as for God's glory. God does not ask anything of man, simply because, as his Sovereign, He has a right to make the demand. There is a loving purpose, a fatherly interest in us, which prompted the giving of the moral law. If we could keep the law perfectly, it would be found to be promotive only of supreme happiness. Our thinking, our outward deportment, our whole life, even our physical life, would be all that it was originally intended to be—in fullest harmony with the divine will, and therefore in fullest harmony with our own highest interest. Hence our *Father* God in His fatherly love has provided, and through His word teaches a moral law, without which there would be moral chaos, and only mis-

ery and death. But since the fall of our first parents, it is not in our power to keep the law, either as a race, or as individuals. Though we make all the effort possible, and seem to succeed in its outward observance, it will be found, upon investigation, that our best obedience is far short of what the spirit and the letter of the law require. Why, then, did our Father, knowing our moral inability to keep it, give a law that would bring us all into condemnation? Of course, we cannot know the divine mind, except as He has chosen to reveal it; but we are told that He had already provided for our deliverance from such condemnation in the person and through the work of His dear Son, even before our creation. From the foundation of the world His Son was slain for the remission of sin, and a way of escape was made from all its direful consequences.—“God so loved the world,” &c. “God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.” “There is, therefore, now no *condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.”

These are but a few of the many familiar passages showing how our Father has provided to save us from the righteous penalty which sin deserved. It was thus plainly in the carrying out of His purposes of love, as a gracious Father, that He has made it possible for us to be again restored to divine favor. His infinite compassion went out toward guilty man; He willingly gave up “His only begotten and well-beloved Son,” as agreed upon in the councils of eternity, “that He might become” the “propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.”

“What,” says one: “Did God the Father punish His own Son for the sin His creature man had committed? Did He, as God the Son, make an atonement to Himself? Can God die and thus satisfy His own justice?” To all of these questions the answer must be an emphatic, No! God did not punish his *Son* for the sin of man, but He did punish *man* in His Son. Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary and of God voluntarily

became the victim to satisfy divine justice. It was not as though God the Father had laid hold upon His Son, and compelled Him to make the satisfaction He did to divine justice. It was the sinless *Godman*, voluntarily taking the sinner's place, and, in His own person, enduring the penalty of the law *as the representative* of the race. It was not God, in the person of the Godman, making an atonement to Himself, but the Son of God, by the assumption of sinless human nature, bringing about an at-one-ment between God and man—a reunion of the divine, and of what was essential in the human—thus objectively delivering man from both the guilt and condemnation of sin. The atonement began in the incarnation of the Son of God; it was consummated in the resurrection, ascension, and session of the Godman, at the right hand of the Father. The death on Calvary, and the descent into Hades, were the culmination of the suffering necessary to satisfy divine justice, and merit for man eternal life, yet it was not God dying, nor man dying, but the Godman. That is to say: it was an infinite suffering, which caused a temporary separation of deity and humanity, as in our death there is a temporary separation of the mortal and the immortal parts of us, but in the case of Christ and His believing disciples this separation was and is only in order to a permanent reunion in the heavenly state. Therefore when He ascended up on high to His Father and our Father, it was in immortal, glorified humanity *as our representative head*. And, now because He lives (in body and soul) we shall live also, if subjectively one with Him.

It belonged to the office of the first Person of the Trinity to provide this full and free salvation in Christ His Son; for the Father, in distinction from the Son and the Holy Ghost, is the fountal source of salvation, as well as of natural creation. Thus all good, whether temporal or spiritual, is from the Father, not only by or through, but in the Son. While all the persons of the Godhead are interested and active in the work of creation, preservation, and redemption, each has an office and work peculiarly His own. The Father is revealed as the Creator,

the giver of law, and the author of salvation from sin and death, but He plans and works by, through, and in the Son, as also through the enlightening, regenerating power of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is the prerogative of the Father to forgive sin, not simply by a declaration to that effect, as a governor, or president pardons a criminal, or as you or I would forgive a debt; not even as an act of infinite compassion toward man, but as an act of infinite justice in *Christ Jesus His Son*, by whom the penalty of sin has been paid, and all the demands of the divine law have been met. So it is God the Father by whom the sinner is justified, not simply in a forensic way, because of any subjective conditions complied with (as in the exercise of repentance and faith), but alone in *Christ Jesus His Son*, to whom the penitent believing sinner is so united as to be one with Him, since, by the operation of the Holy Ghost he is born from above and made a new creature in Christ—a partaker of His very life. It further belongs to the office of the Father to adopt the sinner into His family as His child, and an heir of the heavenly inheritance, not because he has in any sense made himself worthy of such high honor and blessed advantage, but again only because, as an infant or adult, he has been brought into living union with Christ Jesus, having been made alive from the dead by the impartation of a new life in regeneration, the full development of which life constitutes the full-grown Christian, or the one who has reached the stature of manhood in Christ.

Being pardoned, justified and adopted into the family of God, it further belongs to the office of the Father to keep His child “by His mighty power through faith unto salvation,” that His Son may not have suffered in vain, and that the work of the Holy Spirit may not be destroyed. Thus His watchful care is ever over those who are His. He will suffer no temptation to befall them greater than they shall have grace and strength to bear; no enemy shall be able to destroy them (except with their willing consent) and nothing shall separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus shed abroad

in the heart by the Holy Ghost, who is given unto them. When their earthly pilgrimage and conflicts are ended, it will be the pleasure of the Father to translate and admit to His heavenly courts all who have lived and died in the Lord as His loving, devoted children. And on the morning of the resurrection from the dead the Father of their bodies and spirits will call forth their sleeping dust, and, in new and glorified body, reunited to their saved souls, they shall spend an eternity of bliss with the redeemed of all ages, and in closest communion with Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Lastly, it belongs to the office of God the Father to execute justice and wrath upon all who reject or neglect the gracious offers of His grace in Christ His Son. It cannot be said, however, that the Father takes any pleasure in the punishment of sinners who turn away from the salvation He has provided, and refuse its benefits. On the contrary, He desires only the happiness of His creatures. But it is impossible for even Deity to save man against his will. In the very constitution of His being God is *compelled* to exercise justice as well as mercy and love. He has made the fullest possible provision to deliver man from his sin and misery, as already seen. If any one now is determined, in the exercise of his free agency, not to allow God to save him, he must take the consequence, which is a continuance in a state of spiritual death and consequently eternal separation from God and the happy state of heaven. Eternal "banishment from God and the glory of His power," is simply in accordance with the law of cause and effect, or of reaping as we have sown. Even infinite wisdom can devise no way, nor is it possible for infinite power to save a man in his sins. If saved at all, it must be *from* his sins, as divinely ordained, through union with the Lord Jesus Christ in the new birth by the Holy Spirit. When the sinner is not brought into such saving relation to the Father in *Christ*, by the Spirit, or when the offers of His grace are wilfully rejected or neglected there is no alternative but to let justice have its sway, and to execute wrath upon the guilty. It will therefore be the fault of man, and not

the will of the Father, that he perishes. He deliberately fits himself for divine wrath, and *in spite* of the love of God in providing for his salvation, he chooses eternal death and its misery. Entering upon the eternal state in the attitude of one "hating what God loves, and loving what God hates," this attitude of soul continues, and, so far as we know, can never change. Thus of his own free will, having separated himself in the first transgression from the source of his life, and after his loving Father has done all that even Deity could do to reunite him to Himself, and reinstate him in a sacred relation, man must abide the decision of a rejection or neglect of the offers of grace and salvation in Christ. He may compel the Father to refuse him admission into the realm of the redeemed, whose souls have been "washed in the blood of the Lamb," and who have with penitent believing hearts submitted to the plan of salvation by grace in Christ. Electing to remain in a state of alienation and separation from God, is electing to endure the wrath of God against sin, and virtually making ourselves the instruments of its execution.

To recapitulate: The orthodox consensus of the Church's interpretation of the divine word on the subject we have considered seems to be: 1. That God the Father is a distinct eternal personality. 2. That it is His office, in Christ His eternally and only begotten Son, to create and specifically govern the universe for His own glory and the highest good of His creatures, especially those that are rational and intelligent. 3. That He gives and executes all law, both natural and moral. 4. That He has provided a full and free salvation for all the members of a perishing race by giving His Son as the propitiation for sin; and still further, that at the general resurrection of the dead He will call our sleeping bodies from the grave, making them like the glorified and immortal human body of our divine Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and reuniting them with our saved souls. 5. That He will execute justice and wrath upon all who willfully reject or

neglect the great salvation provided in the person and through the work of His Son.

In the holding of these precious truths, with what is taught as to the personality and office of God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, we have a religion that meets all the necessities of our sin-fallen state, affording peace and comfort to the believer in life and in death as no other religion has ever been known to do.

V.

ELISHA AND HIS TIMES.

BY REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

THE books of Kings were written with a definite purpose in view, viz. : to trace the history of God's people with a view to pointing out the cause of the decline and fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. It is held by the author of the Commentary on these books in Lange's series of Commentaries, the Rev. Dr. Bähr, that they were written in the last half of the 70 years' captivity. There was then an urgent need for a treatise, wherein the cause of the decline and fall of the kingdoms was clearly pointed out; in order to be a safeguard to the people in the way of a warning against not only a continuance of, but renewed entrance into idolatry, now that they were scattered among idolatrous people, and peculiarly in danger of doing this. For we find the author clearly pointing out *idolatry* as the great cause of Israel's ruin. To him "idolatry and image-worship are the sin of sins, because they destroyed the world-historical destiny" of God's chosen people. That destiny was to preserve and conserve the knowledge and worship of the true and only God, and transmit to the world the true worship, and, as the custodians of the only supernatural revelation, be the conservators of the truth of God. To hold the people to their duty in this regard, and keep them to adherence of, and submission to the fundamental law, God raised up the prophets, and instituted the prophetic institution, "the mission of which was to watch over the keeping of the covenant, to warn against all manner of apostasy and whensoever it appeared to exhort, to threaten and promise." Hence the prom-

inence given to the prophets in the period of history recorded in the *Book of Kings*—a period when the people were peculiarly led into idolatry. Especially so in the Northern Kingdom, which came under the long, blighting influence of the shrewd, bold, fierce, wicked, unscrupulous, idolatress, Queen Jezebel.

Two prominent characters were Elijah and Elisha.

It is proposed to study briefly a few things concerning the latter and his times. To do so, however, we cannot but note a few points of difference between these two men. Associated together some seven years, their work interblends, or rather is so correlated, that the one cannot be considered without his connection with the other being taken into account. Differing vastly from one another, yet the work of the one was so supplemented; or complemented by that of the other, that the one would be unfinished without the other; and Elisha's mission can hardly be understood without reference to that of Elijah. Take the difference between the two,

1. *As to natures.* Elijah was rough, uncivilized, a man of the desert and wilderness, loving solitude, and dwelling mostly in wilderness and in the country. Elisha was gentle, civilized, a man loving city life and the association of men in the world and in society—living a citizen among citizens, with kindly disposition, and with charity. And then,

2. *As to work.* Elijah's work was *tearing down*; Elisha's was *building up*.

God raises up the right men for the right time and the right work. Elijah, with his peculiar nature and work was necessary, because the people had adopted a god and a religion of power and force. They were to be taught that after all their force was but feebleness. The radical, the harsh, terrible force of Elijah's dealings, showed this. Elijah met his foes on their own ground.

And yet this was not all. There was something characteristic in this display of force on the part of Jehovah. What was that? It was that after all God's force and power were to be shown to be in gentleness, in love, in tenderness, so as to be

represented in striking contrast to the false gods; so that He would be known as a God who could be loved and trusted in childlike faith that would have a loving obedience as its fruit, rather than feared with a cringing, self-pain-inflicting service as its effect. Hence,

(1.) God's manifestation to Elijah in the "still small voice" rather than in the wind, fire and earthquake; and,

(2.) In raising up Elisha with his miracles of kindness and good-will and charity. Why these miracles of Elisha, and so numerous, too? Because God was still to be shown to be the great God over all, the Almighty and Everlasting Jehovah. And yet these miracles were a striking exhibition of a nature governed by kindness, love, good-will. The prophets before Elisha, and those after him, such as Isaiah and Jeremiah, were preachers of righteousness, counselors to kings and people; he went about more as a worker of miracles to confirm the people in their restored faith. And it was just this line of confirmation that was needed; for the people had now for years been taught religiously in this manner,—working of miracles, or rather, performance of startling feats, being an accompaniment of false religions. Heathen prophets were not consulted so much on questions of truth and justice, as to be oracles to the people and kings in the way of foretelling adventures. Elisha, therefore, adopted a method most likely to influence or at least, draw the attention of the people. He is the most successful preacher who knows how to adapt himself to the sympathies of thought and life of his people; using judgment and common sense to find out the openings into the hearts and minds of his hearers; in other words, who like Paul, knows how to become all things to all men, in order by all means to save some. (*I Cor. 9: 22. See also ch. 10: 33.*)

There was, therefore, a necessity for two such men as Elijah and Elisha. Each had an important mission, and yet neither would have been complete without the other. This we can learn when we consider a little more in detail the conditions of the kingdoms. Take

1. *The Northern Kingdom.* The worship of Baal was no longer universal after Elijah's long and vigorous warfare against it. Ahab had given some evidences of repentance; (See 1 Kings 21: 29) and God had shown him mercy and forbearance. And through Ahab's influence after his repentance, no doubt for a time at least, the worship had become somewhat Jehovistic. But Jezebel had great, if not controlling influence over Joram, Ahab's successor; and hence Elijah's reformation did not have the effect it doubtless would have had, had Jezebel not outlived Ahab. And this being the case, though no longer the violent measures and efforts of Elijah were needed, the milder but none the less miraculously effective works and measures of Elisha were required.

2. *Take the Southern Kingdom.* Troubles began there seriously when Jehoshaphat came north to associate with Ahab. "Evil communications corrupt good morals." Sad, inexpressibly sad, is it for any one when he willfully associates with persons of evil influence. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful." (Ps. 1: 1.) Mind acts upon mind, personality upon personality. Goethe said: "Although unconscious of the pleasing charm, the mind still bends where friendship points the way."

The strongest men are marred or made, more or less by their companionships. Especially is this true of young people, whose minds and hearts are plastic and impressible. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, said to an assistant master: "Do you see those two boys walking together? I never saw them together before. You should make an especial point of observing the company they keep; nothing so tells the changes in a boy's character." Some one has well written: "It is the beginning of a tragedy sad beyond thought, when a young man enters a set of a lower tone than his own—the set that drinks a little, and gambles a little, and discusses female frailty a little; some of whom steal a little from their employers, on the score of a small salary, and drink a little more than the rest on the ground of a steadier

head, and affect a little deeper knowledge of the world, and lie with less hesitation and scoff with a louder accent." Carlyle has said, "we grow more by contact of soul with soul than by all other means united."

Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, sat side by side with Ahab, king of Israel. And, of course, troubles began seriously in Judah. These troubles were made worse when his son, Jehoram, married Athaliah, daughter of Jezebel, who inherited all the idolatrous evil nature of her mother. Idolatry with all its attendant vices and demoralizing concomitants was fully instituted in Judah, and the kingdom became weakened. Edom and Moab, tributaries to Judah, rebelled. The Philistines revolted; Libnah and Gath followed, and thus the way was being paved for the final captivity of the people.

Still, before that time came, God was leading His people into a strong re-action against heathenism. He did this in raising up Jehu to do his destructive work. A critical time had come for God's people, as far as their relation with the house of Ahab was concerned. The strain could no longer be kept up, or endured. Says Geikie: "In such a crisis, the prophets, in all emergencies the Swiss guard of the true religion, must at last have felt it imperative to break finally and forever with the house of Ahab. The mass of the people were still more or less loyal to the past, and they were profoundly discontented. The long protest of Elijah and Elisha had spread silently through the land, and had undermined the authority of the reigning house." Jezebel had held wicked sway during two reigns; and through her daughter Athaliah, over both kingdoms. This was unbearably galling, and there could not but be a bounding reaction. And how could this reaction take place without the inauguration of violent measures, to get rid once and forever of the cause of the troubles? Who was there to inaugurate these measures? Who but the head of the prophets "as the divinely commissioned representative of nationality, of the true religion, and of popular freedom and rights." Is it inexplicable, then, however strange and unusual it may be on the part of

Elisha, to find him partaking of, or displaying for the time being the spirit of Elijah, viz: "sternness and fire-like energy," in not only sanctioning, but setting on foot the political action for which he sent to anoint Jehu as king? Moral influences were not capable of accomplishing the reformation needed; the only true course therefore lay in the violent measures adopted by Jehu. What part Elisha took in the wild, radical, harsh, furious movements of Jehu in carrying out the curse of God that rested upon the house of Ahab, further than that recorded, viz. the sending of one of the sons of the prophets to anoint him king, with instructions to destroy the house of Ahab, we have no way of learning; perhaps, with this ended the prophet's direct part in the revolution of Jehu. Nor do we meet with him again, until his meeting the grandson of Jehu, Joash, who comes to lament at the death-bed of the famous, beloved man of God, who symbolically teaches the king that he is to overcome the oppressing enemy, Syria, with three victories. "And Elisha died, and they buried him." Thus passed away one who had performed a wonderful and effective mission on earth, in a long life of faithful service. He was called four years before the death of Ahab, and seven or eight years before Elijah was taken away. He was to Elijah what Joshua was to Moses. Indeed, the same word in Hebrew is used to describe the relation between Elijah and Elisha, and Moses and Joshua. He labored some sixty-five years; fifty-five in the regular prophetic order.

The great and impressive characteristics of Elisha's life and work were love and mercy—gentleness of temper, kind disposition, clarity—characteristics that very forcibly commended the religion of his God to the people, and which together with the *power* that was made evident by the miracles he wrought, could not but be effective for good. Perhaps here one word ought to be said in regard to the one incident in his life which, as it is generally understood, is not compatible with his usual gentleness and love and forbearance; viz.: the destruction of what are called "children" at Bethel. Geikie's

explanation of this is at once so satisfactory and clear that the charge of an "outbreak of unwarrantable anger and harshness," cannot be sustained. I will give his account of this incident. He says: "The choice of Bethel by Jeroboam as the headquarters of the calf-worship, the seat of a grand temple built in opposition to that at Jerusalem, and of a royal palace, had at once flattered and enriched the inhabitants, and kindled their fierce and interested hatred to those who, like the prophets, denounced the royal action. The citizens had become, it would appear, almost the counterparts of the bigoted Moham-medans of Safed or Nablus, who at this day insult and often attack any Christian stranger who enters their limits, even the children cursing the 'infidel' as he passes. As Elisha was making his way up the hill to the town, such an outburst of fanatical hatred greeted him. A band of young men—not children—hurled opprobrious epithets at him as the representative of an ancient faith which they had abandoned. He was to them only a 'bald-head,' i. e., in the old Hebrew vocabulary, a leper, for baldness was a great sign of leprosy, a taunt embodying concentrated hatred and aversion. But it was his religion that was his leprosy in their eyes, for he was still in his early prime, with nearly fifty years of life before him, and physical baldness is not to be thought of." It was but a just and surely a needed exemplary punishment that met these young blasphemers, and its infliction here by the word of Elisha, but shows us that his was a nature rounded and strong, that was made up of tenderness and love, balanced or regulated by stern principles, which caused him to be a man who "knew nothing of the fear of man." His love, his charity, his tenderness, his kind disposition, his gentleness of temper, were characteristic of him above all the saints in the Old Testament, so that he resembled Christ in these, as well as in the miracles of healing the leper, raising a dead man, increasing the loaves; and hence Elisha is a character that commends itself to the world, especially when studied in connection with and in contrast to the sternness of the

Old Testament dispensation—strong, as his miracles show, yet gentle, lovable, tender.* How like Christ! He, too, was great in power, and yet He is above all the *Lamb of God*. The great forces that are to regenerate this sin-cursed earth, that are to break the hearts of stone, that are to lead men to holiness and to God, that are to uplift fallen humanity, are not physical, but spiritual; and hence force of moral and religious character, rather than mere daring, or exhibitions of venturesome spirit, are to be sought after; and they who possess the former are the truly valiant men. The tiger is only fierce and cruel; we call him not valiant. But he is valiant who in love and firmness dares always and everywhere do the right.

DENVER, COLORADO.

*The value of all true preaching and teaching of God's word lies not in lulling a congregation or a people to sleep with smooth flowing periods of soporific words, but in faithfully proclaiming the whole counsel of God, whether that counsel is a message of peace, or a voice of alarm. Justice and love, are to blend in all preaching, if it is to be *the* preaching that God commands. It was Joseph Cook who said, in the best analysis of Henry Ward Beecher's character ever offered to the public: "According to what careful scholars regard as sound thought, the love of God and the justice of God are quadrants in one circle: they run into each other. When you make these quadrants co-ordinate, each as authoritative as the other, you may build on them a tower that leads to godliness. When you drop the quadrant of justice and let it underlap the quadrant of love, you let out a river of gush. There is a gospel that makes iron-sides. Mr. Beecher"—are there, alas! not too many like him?—"unfortunately preached too often another gospel which makes hardly more than jolly-sides." The tendency of man is to extremes or one-sidedness. Strange enough, in preaching this is peculiarly the case. 'Tis the most difficult of tasks to strike a happy mean, or to be rounded in thought. Happy is he who by honest effort attains at least near approaches to this latter!

VI.

IS THE MODERN NOVEL A WORK OF ART?

BY PROF. R. C. SCHIEDT.

THE novel has become the all-absorbing power of modern literature. It threatens like the rod of Aaron to devour all rival forms of written thought. Even treatises on ethics or politics or theology dare not venture abroad except under the charming cover of a love-story; and the very fact that everybody in these days read leads to the conclusion that artistic fiction constitutes the mental food of the world. Hence the novel is used as a means to revolutionize society; through it startling dogmas are proclaimed, new and strange organizations are formed, and a new codex of morals is prescribed. Thus any discussion that touches on art of this kind is practically a discussion about manners and morals of our daily life. We are therefore perplexed how to define the character of modern fiction as bred by modern science and modern democracy. Its advocates assure us that it holds its citizenship in the community of the fine arts with as much dignity as it ever was held by its predecessor, the romance. And yet we must acknowledge that there is a broad chasm between the polite literature of the past one hundred years and that which precedes, beginning with Homer and including Walter Scott. If we compare the simplicity of Homer with the work of the sculptor, the glow of Shakespeare and the tender coloring of Dante with the poetic reflex of the painter, we can only predicate of the modern artistic fiction the mechanism of the camera which gives all in the field of vision in its exact proportion and in its fulness of detail. The actualities of life with which it exclusively deals

do not lead upward to the ideal of our humanity, but downward to the lowest degree of the existing caricatures of our fallen nature.

Yet idealism alone can be called the "Very Art," or the truth of art. "*Actual* human nature is every moral baseness," says Schiller; "but *true* human nature can only be noble." However, such men as Spielhagen, Zola, Henry James, W. D. Howells and others, who take pleasure in passing criticism on their own art,—a thing which neither Dickens nor Scott ever would have done,—seem to have forgotten this broad distinction between themselves and their predecessors, although their theories imply a vast superiority of the modern novel, or, at least, considerable progress in the development of artistic fiction. Their claim would be readily granted if confined to the technique of their works. Every one acknowledges the progress in the technique from Benozzo Gozzoli to the Caracci; but no one will therefore admit that the æsthetic value of the Galeria Farnese, with its exhibition of extraordinary skill, is in the least superior to a single fresco of the Campo Santo, with all its defects in drawing and perspective. However, the claim of our modern writers not only refers to the technique, but especially to the essence of their productions. Mr. Howells says: "The modern novel is finer than its predecessor;" and if we interpret him rightly, he emphasizes the much greater care devoted to the study of passions and emotions, the finer shading of characters and a more profound knowledge of society and its influence upon the individual. He and his contemporaries seem to be ignorant of the fact that the art of the past only gives the essential, but at the same time *all* that is essential. It seems to be characteristic especially of American writers to ignore the prerogatives of the past and to set aside all consideration for right proportions. In their estimation Dickens and Thackeray belong to an old-fashioned antiquity. Even Mr. Henry James, though educated in a classic atmosphere, expresses such an admiration and enthusiasm for M. Aphonse Daudet, that he leaves the reader under the impres-

sion that men like Fielding are of absolutely no account to Americans. Fortunately, Mr. Lowell's eulogy on the author of "Tom Jones" shows that the leading American minds know how to appreciate the true masters of fiction. There are, however, not a few representative critics on the other side of the Atlantic who place any novel writer of modern times above Homer and Thucydides.

Such immature judgments are lauded as highly progressive and vigorous; in reality, they rest upon a complete misunderstanding of fundamental principles. These modern critics do not stand nearer "nature's heart" than their opponents; on the contrary, they have burned behind them the bridge that spans the chasm between nature and our civilization. A boy nurtured in the simplicity of a country home, far away from the tumult of newspapers, will not for a moment hesitate to choose between the "Vicar of Wakefield" and "Numa Roumestan;" but the city gentleman or lady, well versed in newspaper editorials and thoroughly acquainted with the artificial views of modern society, would hardly prefer the pure wine of Goldsmith to the intoxicating liquid of M. Daudet. The age of electricity has on its coat of arms the birth of Minerva; the present generation does not seem to be the result of the normal process of growth. Formerly men were aware that they had a body beneath their garments; to-day this fact seems greatly disputed. We know that our dress, i. e., our civilization, is extremely complicated, and we imagine the more complicated, the more valuable. Therefore the massing of details which characterizes our literature and corresponds to our scientific habits. A microscopical anatomy of human nature, sometimes purely physiological as found in M. Zola and Maupassant, sometimes purely psychological as characteristic of G. Eliot, J. Turgenev, etc., is entirely foreign to the works of earlier writers. The same complication must be predicated of the style: all sciences, every technique, are forced into service; all archaisms and neologisms are collected; strange and startling antitheses are used, in order to make the description

more effective, but all without avail. And strange as it may seem, England, the home of good taste, moderation and sobriety, excels in this tendency. Even the most talented writers overwhelm the reader with an abundance of adjectives, in order to compete with the many scribblers who overcrowd the market with so-called moral pictures.

It is, therefore, not without interest to inquire into the much-discussed and disputed question: *Is the modern novel a work of art?*

The whole intellectual life of the nineteenth century, especially that of its second half, is governed by the *scientific habits and the new codex of morals* which gained ascendancy shortly before the French Revolution, reaching the zenith of their power with the final defeat of romanticism. But both the scientific and the moral criterion are not only not in harmony with art, they are entirely incompatible with it; they are art's negation. Artistic fiction has suffered most of all under the influence of these modern principles because its form is especially adaptable to scientific treatment and moral suasion. Of course, there were men long before the Revolution who erred in this direction; even the Greeks had their Pausan and their Pyreikos; but they were exceptions. In these days all our culture and education, being under the law of books, are governed by analytical and moral diction. No doubt, humanity is, in its habits of life, the same as it ever has been; but its views are changed; life is defined in terms of science and morality.

It is the *office of science* to inquire into the creative forces at work in the universe and to investigate their causes; science analyzes and destroys the individual life in order to find its laws, i. e., that which is common to individual phenomena. Art, on the other hand, endeavors to know and to explain the world by comprehending and reproducing the essential outlines or the idea of the individual life. Art eliminates the merely accidental in order to bring the essential into relief, or, as Macaulay has it, "Analysis is not the business of the poet;

his office is to portray, not to dissect." Now, since we hold that the general is only an abstraction of our mind, and real life finds its expression only in the essential, it must follow that art is, in one sense, truer than science. However, that side of the question does not belong to our discussion. We only want to show that the so-called scientific treatment of a subject belonging to the sphere of fiction can only injure art, just as science is slighted when measured from the standpoint of art.

M. Zola, for example, in relinquishing the claim to the title of an artist, implores in vain the men of science to do him special honors for services rendered in behalf of science. His works are, after all, merely products of his imagination, and therefore entirely worthless for science, which only deals with actualities, and never bases laws upon phantasies. Besides, all scientific labor is collective and progressive, that of the artist is individual and absolute. Every new work of science supercedes its predecessor—at least partly—until it becomes in turn obsolete. The scientific act is immortal, but the scientific work must perish. Is M. Zola, really so conceited as to think "Nana" and "Potbouille" are scientific acts, *i. e.*, rings in the infinite chain of science? Certainly not; perhaps these gentlemen are, after all, not so serious in their interest for science. What they want is to produce works of art with the instruments of science and from material which is the result of science, simply because they have lost on the one hand the tools necessary for works of art, and on the other hand the criterion for the choice of the material has become an unknown quantity to them. Is such undertaking not sure of failure in the start?

The instrument, if this expression is allowed, by which science accomplishes its purposes, is the process of reasoning, that of art is imagination. Science only recognizes a conscious knowledge of things, art an unconscious; and as the artist only reproduces that which he has received directly and unconsciously through imagination or intuition, so the artistic spectator or reader comprehends his subject only intuitively, not con-

sciously or purposely ; both act, as we all do in our daily walk and conversation, therefore art stands nearer to life than science. We know a man as he is, though often we cannot tell whether he has blue or brown eyes, a high or low forehead, yet we are surer of our knowledge of the man than the most minute and accurate description could make us. Thus language is developed ; it is unconsciously learned, often unconsciously used, especially in expressions of affection, and therefore it reproduces our feelings more faithfully than the most careful selection of words could do. Language is for science the same that numbers are for the mathematician ; it does not give a picture, but the abstract expression of things. The physician (*artista*) first receives a general impression of his patient without accounting for it, or even without being able to account for it ; only the quack trusts exclusively in the thermometer and definite symptoms, because he has not the "nack." Homer's "Iliad" is full of similar examples, of which every one who knows his Homer is aware. It seems as if in these days our whole cultured society both readers and artists did not possess any longer that "nack ;" they are proud of being able to give a minute account of all they have consciously recognized, thoroughly investigated and understood. What is the result of this state of affairs ?

How do modern writers describe the world of thought and the world of action ? An exact physiological analysis answers the former, a careful description the latter. But such psychological phenomena do not actually exist, they are merely an abstraction of our intellect ; therefore, even the most perfect enumeration of them will never produce a vivid picture, though our imagination should be able to unify the multiplicity of details, whilst on the other hand a single characteristic stroke of the pencil would suffice to create the most faithful image. The parts do not make the man, but their inter-relation and harmonious co-operations ; as soon as that ceases life ceases (*Iliad* iv. 105-111). But mathematical reasoning never grasps the essence of totality, that belongs to unconscious imagination ; to

reproduce this totality, i. e., to embody the idea of life as a whole in its work is the office of art. The same is true of the description of the *external world*. Pyreikos, who painted with the ardor of a Dutch painter only the details of barber-shops and dirty stores, was called by the Greeks the "rhyporographer," or mud-painter. To-day this very practice is applauded. A whole page of M. Daudet's, on which he describes all the merchandise of a Southern sausage-dealer with all its fragrance, and the household utensils in all their detail is not worth the two strophes in which H. Heine shows us the cave of Uraka so vividly that we shudder. Daudet's description is a minute account such as we never make in actual life; it has, therefore, just as little hold on our imagination as any list of household furniture. Heine's two strophes transport us into a certain mood, awaken in us a sensation which at once arouses our imagination to action; the very description here is action and the effect upon the reader is but its reaction.

Art is more *economical* than science, more economical than those authors who record with scientific conscientiousness all the detailed results of an action and its motives. They are poor householders who do not understand how to invest their money. Art shows us Philine sitting upon the saved trunk rattling her keys, whilst confusion and despair reigns all around her. She is thus irresistible, and stands before our eyes more vivid than a long enumeration of her charms, or even a description of the magic remedies would have done which gave her such power. A modern writer would certainly have taken hold of the opportunity and given us both, for descriptions and definitions are their chief hobby. We do not deny at all that we find in these modern novels a more minute observation of psychological and social phenomena, a more accurate study of all the modes of feeling and thinking, a more conscientious care of their development and a more eager analysis of passions and their motives than in the older novels of our age. The whole course of a man's life is minutely given, perhaps also that of his parents and grand parents—they call it making poetical use of

scientific results—until we have forgotten the man himself. True art cares as little for the development of a man's character as life itself; it introduces him as complete and leaves his actions and words explain him. Shakespeare leaves it to the learned doctors to explain how Hamlet *became* what he is, he is satisfied to show him as he *is*. And not the drama shows man as he is and not how he came to be so, but also the novel, as long as it is a work of art.

Pourquoi Manon, dès la première scène
Est-elle si vivante et si vraiment humaine
Qu'il semble qu'on l'a vue et que c'est un portrait ?

asks Musset. Is it not because she is not described, analyzed and defined, but because she simply appears and acts? Because the poet, in a few words, reflects his own impression, and thus excites our interest. We never see persons and actions of fiction; we feel the impression which they make; that alone convinces; an enumeration of attributes and circumstances, even if possible to perfection, never arouses our imagination or addresses our feelings; it merely gives us a certain quantity of knowledge.

However the reply is made that former writers confined themselves almost exclusively to sketches and outlines. That is absolutely false. The principal points of the narrative are the dramatic moments of an action, the characteristic features of a person. The faithfulness and vividness with which each single feature—expressing totality in nuce—is given, creates a true picture of the whole man, with all its antecedents, its consequences and its circumstances, i. e., a picture not of the individual parts, but of their harmonious oneness. His procedure is similar to that of the sculptor, who reproduces only the plastic elements of the painter, and only the picturesque position of his subject, neglecting everything else; he only takes up those features which can be made literary effectual. But it is with actions as with men. A very minute, methodical enumeration of all the movements of the different accurately-named regiments which have taken part in a battle, may have and has

scientific value for the historian; in a work of art it is absolutely of no effect—nay, it is the very opposite, because it does not give us a vivid picture of the totality of the action; whilst the description of the battle of Leuthen from the pen of the poor man of Tockenburg, and that of the battle of Waterloo, in Stendhal's "*Chartreuse de Parme*," are the works of art, because they faithfully reproduce the impression which such voluminous actions make upon the individual. Open "*Vanity Fair*" and read the summons to the field of Waterloo; note how the heartless disloyal coxcomb at that trumpet call suddenly becomes a man and realizing for the few hours allotted to him of his worthless life—so the brief mention with which he is dismissed allows us to suppose—the description of Wordsworth's 'Happy Warrior' turns his necessity to glorious gain." Or turn back from a great dramatic artist to the great dramatic artist; read in Henry V. the night before Agincourt. Shakespeare intensifies the lesson of Thackeray. He shows us war as a source of the glow that comes over a man when he feels himself to be a member of a nation. "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers," that is how war looks to the artist. Tolstoi, in "*Peace and War*," on the other hand, drags us to the surgeon's tent and turns his camera on the operating-table, forces us to hear the shrieks of brave men, to see blood, torn and quivering flesh, to assist at the last convulsion of the dying. We feel the very opposite from all that noble emotion with which Shakespeare thrills us; we are here made to sympathize with selfish cowardice, with an engrossing care for one's own skin. Both are true pictures, but the one belongs to the artist, the other to the historian."* Tolstoi's description, though beautiful in itself, reminds us of the quarrel of the two washerwomen in "*Assommoir*," which fills many, many pages, but leaves no impression of the whole scene, whilst the Homeric fight of Molly Seagrim remains indelible upon the memory of every one that read it *once*. So, M. Zola treats his subject as the man of science, he destroys it first in order to construct

* Julia Wedgewood in the "*Contemporary Review*."

it. Fielding treats it as the artist, who seeks and reproduces unity; not to mention his skill with which he handles rather questionable subjects, making them by his masterly satire fit for literary treatment. However, that leads us to a controversy with the Verists, Realists, Naturalists, etc., which we shall leave for another time.

The modern novel is not a work of art, on account of its *false moralizing tendencies*. These have become still more injurious to art than the scientific treatment. We only mention the name of Tolstoi, the leader of a whole host of moralizing, theologizing, socializing writers. All modern morality has but one aim, *i. e.*, to make men better than they are. Art takes them as they are; it suffices to comprehend them and make them comprehensible. And the more humanity has retreated from the fundamental principles of Christianity, *charitas* and election by grace, so very objectionable to rationalists, the more decided has this tendency become, in modern literature, to make men better, to convert them through human means. Mr. Tolstoi and Mr. Bellamy shake hands. All men shall become equal in virtue as well as in possessions. Of course such Utopias never have an influence on life as it is; no system of morals will change the nature of man, as no form of socialism can ever essentially change the conditions of wealth and poverty; but they influence men's judgment, and since that is of paramount importance among modern writers, they influence literature.

Up to the middle of the last century every rank and every individual accepted the condition of humanity as well as of nature as something fixed, something that cannot be changed. Men lived and acted, wrote poetry and enjoyed life in a naive way, without reflection, or, at least, without comparing the world and its laws with the norms of strict reasoning. A man from the humblest ranks of the people entertained the idea of becoming a citizen just as little as we do the idea of becoming kings and princes. And if one dared to rise, and really succeeded, it was only because he, as an individual, felt his supe-

rior power, not because he thought he had a right to his action as a man. Whatever he became, he became

Et par droit de conquête et par droit de naissance.

His personal gifts justified his claim, but not a so-called justice to which to-day every mediocre parvenu appeals, and which all our speeches, theories and instructions advocate, thus enticing men to enter the higher walks of life where they generally feel themselves most miserable. This constant comparison of fixed results with the postulates of reason is a peculiar disease of our age. Mr. Iron's (Miss Shreiner) "African Farm," that strange confusion of bitter irony and haughty superiority represents the fever heat of this disease. It is the demand of this so-called human morality that we should put ourselves in the place of others, not by direct intuition, but by an abstraction which brings all men down to the same level,—the most important part of this demand, however, is that the others should take our place, especially if the latter is not so very desirable. Both are fictitious, and can only be carried out in thought, never in actual life. Every man has his own idiosyncrasies, so *grosso modo* every nation, and also every rank. This misunderstanding of natural barriers has led, *in politics*, to the claim and granting of rights to persons who do not understand how to use them; *in social life* it has caused a displacement of given conditions, an exchange of the natural atmosphere which can only leave painful impressions; *in literature* it has given to men thoughts and feelings which they never have. We expect our fellow creatures to be something entirely different from what they really are, because we want them to correspond to the abstract moral type which we have constructed of them. The authors are very rare who understand how to reproduce the feelings of the men from the humblest walks of life; the majority of the readers prefer the methods of George Sands' novels, in which the peasants have nothing but the garb of their brethren in actual life.

In the life of the state and society both tendencies cause

many a disastrous disturbance, without, however, changing in the least the form of either. In literature, which does not deal with living personalities upon terra firma, but with ethereal figures of imagination upon patient paper, this new tendency has wrought a much more thorough-going revolution. It is true, the claims of rationalism to regulate legislation according to preconceived ideas of equality and justice, have not been without their influence, but on the whole the states have continued, in our century as well as in all the preceding, to register and codify the existing customs, and to regulate the new interests and conditions. It is likewise true that in almost all countries every citizen has been granted equal rights with his fellow-citizens, but in reality the power has remained in the hands of the educated and the wealthy. Attempts have indeed been made to give Egypt and Turkey western constitutions, but it required only one year to show that different shoes need different lasts. The same is true of society. Children never find the given social order, as far as they can comprehend it, unjust or unnatural. We saw the bricklayer lay his bricks, the farmer cut his corn, the laborer saw his wood, without ever asking the question why our parents did not need to do all this. In this sense almost all men before the French revolution were children; and perhaps five-sixths of humanity are still so to-day; it is good that it should be so. The whole human machinery would stand still if we should constantly put ourselves in other men's places, constantly trouble ourselves to secure for all the same conditions according to the demands of an abstract equality. Mere desires, therefore are the outcome of the whole movement; they may suffice to make men, who hitherto were happy with their lot, dissatisfied, but they will never be strong enough to change their condition. "Nothing is in itself good or bad," says Hamlet, "Our reflection only makes it so." As soon as a man ceases to think of the work which he has to do, in order to reflect on the reason why he has to do such and such work, so soon his contentment is gone. But that is evidently the result of modern philanthropy in opposition to Christian charity; although

we do not deny that the former has done much good for the working classes, especially through their numerous aid societies, in cases of extreme poverty, of sickness, old age and death. Besides, we must always remember that the positive evil is not by far as great as it seems, because the vast majority of men will continue to take the world as it is and never bother themselves about how it ought to be.

After all only the literati are theorists who differ so vastly from other men in their position to these modern tendencies, and their number has been from the last century ever on the increase. And since our whole education is to-day a literary or book education, all who call themselves educated are literati. The cultured or educated man of former times, who received his education by his daily contact with men, and for whom the book was only of interest, inasmuch as it was the reflector of life and not its criterion, becomes more and more a rarity. Our whole culture is influenced by our literature, reader and author live in the same atmosphere of unreality, or in order to be somewhat clearer, they divide life into two halves, the practical—the author's book making it intensely practical—and the intellectual, two spheres that never touch, not even when the intellectual takes its subject matter from the practical, for the former deprives such matters at once of its actuality and uses it only after it has falsified it. M. Tocqueville has a chapter: how in the eighteenth century the literati of France became the chief politicians. At the present time this is the case every where, since Disraeli's reforms the political life of England has been infected by the literati; but much more so that of France and the United States, where the whole government is practically in their power. However, art and literature, are the most delirious patients, and to these we shall now confine ourselves exclusively.

The novels of our time in which the moralizing tendency is not the all-absorbing passion, are very rare. Even where gross immorality or indecency is the subject, the author is conscious, or perhaps unconscious of a certain didactic tendency. Yea in

the most objective of modern novels, "Madame Bovary," one can feel that the author has an aim which is not purely artistic, namely, to warn of a certain education and certain books. In Zola's and Tolstoi's writings it is very evident that their filthy personalities should serve as examples of warning. Also the German novelists do not hesitate to confess that the moral criterion is at the basis of all their works, in England and America they even boast of it. The Americans however deserve the credit of never having stooped to the obscene. This does not mean, of course, that morality, like every other human interest, should not have citizenship in the sphere of art. It only depends what we understand under morality, the rational, healthy morality which finds its fullest expression in the cultivation of the truth, or the manufactured sickly morality whose mother is vanity and whose sponsor the lie. It shows healthy morality, when Prince Henry forsakes his glutton companion, as soon as the responsibility of the crown reminds him of the earnestness of life, unhealthy morality, when Victor Hugo confuses the peoples' good sense of right and wrong, in eulogizing a galley-prisoner, who was the victim of a judicial error. This is not the place to explain any further, that in-born or instinctive morality, which characterized humanity before the victory of rationalism, nor is it necessary to reiterate how Kant tried to prove scientifically, these unconscious ethics of his doctrine of the unintelligible character, or Schopenhauer by his theory of compassion; it suffices for our purpose to state that the morality of a *modern* writer has a different basis and a different aim, and that this is just as incompatible with art as it is impossible that art should ever adapt itself to it. This modern morality may apparently be as widely different in itself, as that of M. Zola from that of Mr. Howells or Mrs. Ward or Margaret Deland, however they all have the same family resemblance; *dissatisfaction* with the world as it is, therefore the great wretchedness of this whole literature. "Ernst ist das Leben, heiter ist die Kunst," says Schiller, or as J. Paul puts it "Die Kunst ist zwar nicht das Brod, aber der wein des Lebens," to-day art is too

earnest, a kind of divine service for Richard Wagner, a moral or political lesson for G. Freitag, Tolstoi, Victor Hugo, Bellamy, etc. And how could it be otherwise? If we constantly compare the world and human nature with an *ideal* which is entirely arbitrary and unreal, they will appear very unsatisfactory and call forth severe criticism. How morose are after all George Elliot's novels in their underlying principles, how bitter those of Charlotte Bronte, how infinitely sad Miss Poynter's "Among the Hills," to mention a less known masterpiece of this gloomy psychologically moral art. All great writers of former times from Homer to Cervantes, from Lesage to Smollet, from Grimmelshausen to Walter Scott, please heart and mind by their good humor and even the tragic muse knows how to transport

"The gloomy play of truth into the happy realm of art."

But to-day we feel depressed, and shiver, so serious appear the faces of our authors, so hollow are their voices, when they speak of things for which their predecessors had a smile.

Even sensuality which formerly appeared naive and nude, and asked with a smile for admission into literature, is now serious; considered more a product of corrupt reflection than of overflowing strength and vigor, although it must be said for the sake of truth that the modern novel is on the whole less under the ban of this refined, unhealthy sensuality than modern poetry. On the other hand however, the novel has acquired a certain sentimental sympathy for all phenomena and types which used to be objects of ridicule. Who would dare to-day to treat the stammering Bridgson comically? Sympathy for his ailment would certainly forbid such treatment. Tender-hearted as we are, we would put ourselves in his place and make a tragic figure out of him. The pedantic scholar whom the world has laughingly for centuries called an awkward or vain bookworm, becomes under G. Eliot's skill an unfortunate man who strives after a wrong ideal, but in whom the most brilliant of all women herself sees an ideal. George Dandin who marries the lady of blue blood and who soon enough receives his just punishment—

a constant source of irony for former writers—has become a kind of martyr, since we have put ourselves in his place. Whatever is, objectively considered comical, becomes, subjectively considered, tragic; our tender little self suffers and it is but natural that it should have sympathy with itself. All people before the 19th century laughed at the old man who marries the young girl; applauded when the courageous youth fooled the sentimental weak maiden,—mocked the awkward pedant who allowed the shrewd son to abduct his wife—to-day's criterion morally sentimental as it is calls forth moral indignation against the seducer and a noble sympathy for his victim—a sentiment which of course shows our superior morality, but art is not possible under such circumstances because it simply sees these things, without criticising them, it reproduces what it sees, not what our moralizing judges wish to see or what the tender-hearted imagine to see.

How rudely would all these bright figures, living in our imagination, be destroyed, if we should give them to our conscientious authors for correction. Think of poor Manon under the rod of Jane Eyre the school-mistress. Think of Squire Western in the clinique of M. Zola: "If you continue to get drunk every night, whilst your daughter plays the harpsichord, you will have to expect a terrible end, Squire. Shall I describe it to you? I have carefully studied it in the hospital, the delirium tremens potatorum, the punishment which awaits all alcoholized fellows as you are." And our old friend Falstaff whom Shakespeare treats with so much indulgence, would have received a tremendous lecture at the hands of G. Elliot. "Really Sir John, you have no excuse whatever, if you would be a poor devil from among the lower class of people, who had only bad examples before him, but you had all the advantages which fate can grant a man. You belong to a good family, you have received the best education in Oxford, you are highly connected, and yet you have fallen so very low. Do you know why? I have warned my Tito so often against that: Because, you acted exactly as you pleased avoiding all inconvenience and un-

necessary efforts." "And you Miss Philine," Mr. Howells would say, "if you continue in your present conduct, leaving your slippers in young gentlemen's rooms, I shall write a severe denunciation against you, as I did against my hero Bartley, who likewise conquered all hearts but was after all nothing but a very frivolous fellow,—or I bequest you to my friend Mr. James who will analyze you until no one can recognize you any more. That will teach you to retract and to become converted, i. e., a different woman." To become converted is the first requirement of all the novel heroes of our day; Fielding would have rather expected that the viper should lose its poison than that Blifil should have ceased to be a rascal.

I mentioned Howells' denunciation of his own hero in the most perfect of his novels. We find a similar position in almost all novels of modern times; it seems as if the authors wanted to persecute certain persons, whom they learned to know and to hate in actual life, by making them the still more hateful types of novel heroes—a tendency, which is the very opposite of that of the true artist, who neither hates nor loves his subjects, and to whom a Richard III is just as interesting as Antonio. Think of G. Elliot's most successfully drawn character, Rosamund, with what genuine feminine perfidy she tries to discredit her. How differently does Abbé Prevôt treat his Manon! Even Richardson and in modern times the German Gotthelf, though beginning with volumes of sermons and good advice, cannot resist the in-born impulse of the artist; they all at once forget that they intended to teach and present their subject with æsthetic indifference, not to mention the chief factor, namely that even their moralizing efforts contain nothing which rebels against art. It is just the opposite with G. Elliott and W. D. Howells, they want to be objective and artistic, but soon the moralist gets the better of them.

As you perceive, I only mention first-class novels and novel writers, and among them only those who might be artists if the moralizing disease of the present age would not have taken hold of them. However we forget too often how deeply rooted

this disease is, because habit and customs make such moralizing conventionality appear perfectly natural. Other times have experienced conventionalities, much more severe, but then they remained on the surface; ours seem more easy, more acceptable, but they penetrate into our very marrow. It is incredible, what a mass of artificial sentiments, interests and duties we drag along with us; how thoroughly our language and all our actions are governed by them. All kinds of enthusiasm for nature, for art, for philanthropy, overcrowd our very life; we believe in the reality of sentiments which were never felt, or we replace nature by culture so-called to-day. Shakespeare could not create an Othello, who would listen to the malicious calumniations of Iago, because no gentleman would allow such a thing; and the gentleman has swallowed the man. Even the quarrel between Antonio and Tasso would not be tolerated on the modern stage, because such a thing is unworthy of gentlemen. So much so has our language suffered under the tyranny of conventionality, that it has become wholly insufficient to allow cultured people to express their feelings. Let a cultured lady dare speak as Queen Constanze or Margreth of Anjou, and she would at once be stamped as scandalously rude. This is by the way also the reason why modern dramas are and must be so tedious. The reason for the conspicuous phenomenon that almost all important works of fiction of our age choose their heroes from the humblest classes of society is obvious, because there alone exists a direct contact between language and life. Strange to say, this conventionality shows itself especially in the United States, in the land of broadest liberty. Here Puritanism the severest of all shades of Christian belief still exercises a marked influence. Only a rest of Puritanism can explain the stilted novels of Hawthorne, explain the reason how W. D. Howells a man of so much talent, taste and even humor could create a comical figure as his Ben Halleck, without perceiving that it is so tremendously ridiculous.

There is a constant lamentation that the present age is so intensely prosaic. Sentimentalists and other people feel the want

of former comforts, which have been banished by electricity and steam. But have you ever thought of the much more unnatural prose of our whole feeling and thinking? Where is the source of all poetry, in the reality of our feeling or in the decoration of the stage of life? In the style of our garments or in the heart that beats beneath them? What we need is, to learn to feel, to think and to see naturally—and art will flourish again. Christianity has not yet said its last word, the spirit of history carries and ever will carry us onward to other spheres, to broader views of humanity and its grandeur, until art will kneel before Him who is "the altogether Lovely," when the City of God has descended upon the institutions and civilizations of men.

VII.

BEAUTY AND ART.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.

"THE beautiful," says Emerson, "rests on the foundations of the necessary." In this he is unquestionably correct. Beauty in itself is not something merely imaginary and ephemeral. On the contrary, it has its origin in God, and is as real and eternal as its source. Hence, as Keats so admirably tells us in the opening lines of his "Endymion,"

"A thing of beauty is a joy forever ;
Its loveliness increases ; it will never
Pass into nothingness."

Moreover, having its source in God, beauty characterizes all the works of God. In nature, as it comes from the Creator, its presence is everywhere manifest. It appears in the sparkling gem and in the cragged cliff ; in the murmuring brook and in the placid lake ; in the rosy-fingered dawn and in the golden-tinted sunset ; in the fleecy cloud and in the harmoniously-blended colors of the rainbow ; in the blooming flowers and in the ripening fruits ; in the songs of birds and in the humming of bees ; in the gambols of the lamb and in the fleetness of the deer ; in the innocent smile of infancy and in the rosy cheeks of youth ; in the grace of maidenhood and in the vigor of manhood ; in the starry heavens above us and in the moral law within us. Only where the poison of the serpent has utterly quenched the divine spark of life is beauty, indeed, wholly absent.

If we now turn to Art, we find that

"Art is Nature made by Man,
To Man, the interpreter of God."

"Art," says Sir Thomas Browne, "is the perfection of nature. Were the world now as it was the sixth day, there were yet a chaos. Nature hath made one world, and art another. In brief, all things are artificial, for nature is the art of God." The province of Art lies, accordingly, in the sphere of the Beautiful, and its true mission is to minister to man's innate love of the beautiful, and thus to satisfy one of the deepest needs of his higher and more spiritual nature. And as God is the absolutely beautiful, as well as the absolutely true and the absolutely good, we may accept as substantially correct the statement of Bulwer Lytton, that "Art, in fact, is the effort of man to express the ideas which Nature suggests to him of a power above Nature, whether that power be within the recesses of his own being, or in the Great First Cause, of which Nature, like himself, is but the effect."

Beauty and Art are, indeed, very closely allied. The understanding of the one involves the understanding of the other. As we can judge correctly of the physical structure of the finny inhabitants of the ocean, only as we are acquainted with the nature of the element in which they live and move and have their being; so can we judge correctly of Art and its productions, only as we rightly apprehend the peculiar characteristics of the Beautiful. In any thorough consideration of Art, the question, What is the Beautiful? is therefore of primary significance and importance. Consequently, this question has claimed the attention of the ablest thinkers from the days of Socrates down to the present time, and very probably from a much earlier period.

To the question itself various answers have been given. In all of these there are to be found important elements of truth, but none can be said to meet perfectly all the requirements of the case. There is even reason to believe that a complete answer is impossible, on the ground that beauty is a simple and primary quality, and that simples can only be directly known and felt. But this does not preclude the importance of considering the question. For though we may never be able to

give an absolutely satisfactory explanation of the nature of the beautiful, we may nevertheless show in what respects it differs from other qualities, and under what conditions it reveals its presence, and thus attain to clearer ideas concerning it.

Beauty, there is reason to believe, has not only its source in God, but is in itself a divine quality. The relation of God to man may therefore be said to be typical of the relation of beauty to the mind of man. As the existence of God is independent of the being of man, so is the existence of beauty independent of the mind of man which apprehends it and finds pleasure in it. And as man can truly know God, only because he has been made in the image and likeness of God; so can he truly know the beautiful and rejoice in it, only because beauty has entered into the inmost constitution of his being. Beauty has consequently both an objective and a subjective existence, and these correspond the one to the other.

As a subjective experience, the beautiful is a peculiar feeling of delight awakened in us by some object in which objective beauty is present. In some respects it is akin to the agreeable, but differs from it in that it is never of a merely sensuous character, as the latter mostly is, and "depends not," to use the language of Professor Lindner, "upon the *content of the individual*, but upon the *form of the composite*." In other words, the æsthetic feeling always includes thought-feeling as well as sense-feeling. By sense-feeling I mean feeling directly occasioned by some object of sense; and by thought-feeling, feeling produced by some definite form of thought. Moreover, to create the impression of the beautiful these feelings must be so related as to merge into one another and form a complete unity. A mere aggregation of feelings, no matter how agreeable or pleasing they may be individually, or how diversified in character, can never produce in us the sensation of beauty.

Another characteristic of æsthetic feeling, is that it does not value the objects which call it forth for anything excepting what they are as complete in themselves. In their mere contemplation it finds its full satisfaction, so that even the wish of

possessing them is excluded. In this respect it especially differs from the feeling of desire, which craves things for its own satisfaction, and, accordingly, estimates them differently at different times, as the craving for them is greater or less; and also from the feeling awakened by the useful, which is not preferred for itself alone, but from other reasons. In that it is a feeling of the direct and unconditioned valuation of the object apprehended, it also differs from the emotions awakened in us by the true and the good. In the apprehension of the true, it is the reality of things and their relations; and in the case of the good the nature of things and their purposes, that primarily claim our attention. Hence neither of these necessarily presents itself as of unconditioned value, as in the case of the beautiful, in which the perfection of that which is viewed is that which chiefly impresses us.

If, now, we turn our attention to the consideration of objective beauty, we find that its primary requisite is form. Without this there can be nothing beautiful. A formless force, though it may have objective existence, and may be able greatly to affect us, can never produce in us the æsthetic feeling. The form, however, need not necessarily be of a material nature, but may be the product of the mind, especially of the imagination, and therefore of an intellectual and spiritual character. This is evident from the fact that not merely works of architecture, sculpture and painting, but also music, poetry and moral actions inspire in us a sense of beauty. In either case, however, the form must be definitely visible or conceivable, and in both cases it must be agreeable to the percipient mind. Vagueness is inimical to beauty, and so also is everything that is disagreeable and repulsive to the beholder. Moreover, the form must always embody thought, and be in proper accordance with the thought which it is designed to express. For, as we have already seen, the æsthetic feeling is not of a merely sensuous character, but includes in it the impression of thought. Therefore the object that would give birth to it must reflect the presence of thought, and reflect it in a perfectly rational manner.

A second requisite of objective beauty is diversity. The strictly simple is never beautiful. A straight line, a single tone, a simple color, has nothing of the æsthetic in it. When several lines, or tones, or colors, however, are properly combined, the quality of beauty becomes manifest, and the greater the diversity in such case the greater the beauty. This is, no doubt, owing to the fact that the beautiful is especially an inherent element of life and intelligence, which in their highest forms always possess the greatest diversity of qualities and powers.

Still another requisite of objective beauty is unity. No matter how great the diversity of form and color that may be present in an object, and how agreeable each may be in itself, yet if they do not constitute a harmonious whole the object will not appear beautiful. Flowers which separately may impress us as the incarnation of beauty, may yet be so arranged in a bouquet as to make it something æsthetically repulsive. So no diversity of sound, unless the different notes be in accord with one another, no amount of varied thought however well expressed, unless one great thought pervades all, can awaken in us the æsthetic feeling. Only when in an object of any kind, color blends with color, and form adjusts itself to form, and thought to thought, so as to give evidence that one spirit pervades the whole, can it ever be to us "a thing of beauty and a joy forever."

If, now, we compare and carefully consider the various elements that enter into subjective and objective beauty, according to the analysis presented, we shall find that they not only correspond one to another, but that they all may be summed up in the word *harmony*, taken in its widest significance as involving perfect adjustment of parts and unity of being in all the various spheres of manifested existence. "The whole effect of a beautiful object, so far as we can explain it," says the author of the article on *Æsthetics*, in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in his *Outlines of Psychology*, "is a harmonious confluence of these

delights of sense, intellect, and emotion, in a new combination. Thus a beautiful natural object, as a noble tree, delights us by its gradations of light and color, the combination of variety with symmetry in its contour or form, the adaptation of part to part, and of the whole to its surroundings; and finally by its effect on the imagination, its suggestions of heroic persistence, of triumph over the adverse forces of winds and storms. Similarly, a beautiful painting delights the eye by supplying a rich variety of light and shade, of color, and of outline; gratifies the intellect by exhibiting a certain plan of composition, the setting forth of a scene or incident with just the fullness of detail for agreeable apprehension; and lastly, touches the many-stringed instrument of emotion by a harmonious impression, the several parts or objects being fitted to strengthen and deepen the dominant emotional effect, whether this be grave or pathetic, on the one hand, or light and gay on the other. The effect of beauty, then, appears to depend on a simultaneous presentment in a single object of a well-harmonized mass of pleasurable material or pleasurable stimulus for sense, intellect and emotion."

But perhaps it will here be objected that in all forms of life and in all the products of the intellect we have the three elements of form and diversity and unity, and that yet beauty is not a characteristic of all these forms and products. I would say in reply, that all perfect life and all perfect intellectual productions are beautiful, and that those that fail to impress us as such fail to do so because of their imperfection. And here it is further to be observed that things may be perfect in one respect without being perfect in other respects, which nevertheless come within our apprehension. The man, for instance, who uses language incorrectly, may give a perfect answer in his way to a question put to him, but as the incorrect form, as well as the perfect content of his answer claims our attention, the perfection of the whole is marred, and, consequently, also its beauty. Accordingly there is reason to believe that whenever living beings and the creations of the intellect are devoid

of æsthetic value, it is owing to some defect in form or content or relation, if not in all these respects.

Absolute perfection we have only in God, because in Him alone there is perfect consistency of being and of action. Infinite in power and wisdom and righteousness and goodness, there is no conflict of any kind in Him. Unlimited in the variety of His excellencies, He is yet the one true and living God, the absolutely harmonious, and therefore the absolutely beautiful.

In nature everywhere, as has already been indicated, there is beauty to be found, because everywhere it bears upon it the impress of its Creator. No less true than really poetical are the words of the Psalmist :

"The heavens declare the glory of God ;
The skies show forth the work of His hands,
Day unto day is pouring out speech,
And night unto night breathing knowledge,
Without speech and without language,
Without their voice being heard,
Into all the earth their sound goeth out,
And their words to the end of the world."

But while this is true, it is also true that the works of God do not all reveal His beauty in equal degree, but only as they approach His likeness. Accordingly, the beauty of the mineral is not equal to that of the vegetable, and that of the vegetable not equal to that of the animal, and that of the animal still inferior to that of man. In man alone do we, indeed, find the highest type of terrestrial beauty. His body, it is universally admitted, is the most beautiful of physical creations. But still more beautiful is his soul, especially when attuned in harmony with the Spirit of God. For as Plato tells us in the *Symposium*, "The beauty of the mind is more honorable than the beauty of the outward form." Speaking of Christ, the Rev. Frederick W. Robertson very truly as well as eloquently says : "If any one ever felt the beauty of this world, it was he. The beauty of the lily nestling in the grass—he felt it all ; but the beauty which he exhibited in life was the stern loveliness of moral action. The

King in his Beauty 'had no form nor comeliness;' it was the beauty of obedience, of noble deeds, of unconquerable fidelity, of unswerving truth, of Divine self-devotion. The Cross! the Cross! We must have something of iron and hardness in our character. The Cross tells us what is the true Beautiful which is Divine: an inward, not an outward beauty, which rejects and turns sternly away from the meretricious forms of the outward world, which have a corrupting or debilitating tendency." Equally true are the words of Dryden:

"From harmony, from heavenly harmony,
This universal frame began:
From harmony to harmony
Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
The diapason closing full in Man."

"Corporeity," it has been claimed, "is the end of the ways of God." With equal propriety it may also be said that Beauty is the end of the ways of God, and that this has been attained in the glorified Christ.

But not only do we find a process of development in the manifestation of beauty in the natural world, but also in man's apprehension of its presence. The infant is not able to appreciate the beautiful in nature or in art to the same degree as the fully matured man or woman. So the savage and untutored mind can not apprehend its presence to the extent that the civilized and cultured mind can. This accounts for the difference in men's æsthetic judgments. The immature and the uncultured are apt to be attracted most by the lower forms of beauty, because being simpler their harmony is more apparent and more readily apprehended, while, as a general thing, the mature and the highly cultured will be most attracted by the higher forms whose harmony involves more complex qualities, and therefore requires more highly trained intellectual powers properly to understand it. Then again, the untutored may fail to detect the presence of serious defects in an object, and so look upon it as beautiful, while the trained mind will at once detect these defects and consequently find no harmony nor beauty in it. In

this way it will be seen that great diversity of opinion, and even contradictory judgments, can be accounted for without denying that the elements of the beautiful are in all cases the same.

In accounting for men's judgments as to the beautiful, it is also necessary that we should take into consideration the disturbing influence of sin. Man as he comes into this world, is not in a perfectly normal condition. The current of his life has, in many respects, been perverted by evil. Naturally he is not in harmony with the Divine, and therefore the truly beautiful fails in many cases to attest itself to him as such, and he accepts the false as the more attractive because it is more in harmony with his depraved tendencies and feelings. In this way the really ugly and injurious may for a time commend itself as being even the offspring of the highest beauty. In the course of time, however, the idols of our corrupt nature are generally destroyed by the disorganizing power that produced them. Nevertheless, as evil has never yet been utterly eradicated from the hearts of men, there is reason to fear that much that has even stood the test of centuries, is not as fair as it doth seem to be. We need therefore to seek continually to have our feelings and thoughts sanctified by the Spirit of God that we may not be led inadvertently into the dangerous quagmires of iniquity by the *ignis fatuus* of a beauty which has clothed itself in the livery of heaven to serve the evil one. Only the truly good man can always tell the truly beautiful.

But if the views that have been advanced concerning the beautiful be correct, then certain conclusions necessarily follow as regards Art. To some of these I would now direct attention.

And first of all it is evident from what has been said, that if the mission of Art be to minister to man's love of beauty, and at the same time to interpret God to him, then true Art cannot be a mere copy or imitation of any of the manifold objects of the natural world. For were it nothing but this, it would have no real ministry and be no interpreter, since it would give us nothing but what we have already in nature itself. Art, therefore, if it is to have any true mission must be something more than

an imitation, or mere reproduction. It must reveal to us the ideal. By the ideal I do not mean anything unreal or merely fanciful, but that which is most real and true, namely the Divine idea that is the essential element of everything that is. Our actual life, as we all consciously recognize, does not properly realize God's design in our creation; and what is true of us in this respect, is true also of all the works of nature by which we are surrounded. In the actual world as we know it there is nothing perfect. A resisting and disturbing power interferes with the free and harmonious movements of all the various forces of nature. Now to show us what these forces would actually produce, if left freely and harmoniously to manifest themselves in their appropriate forms, this is the true work of Art. Only through this kind of work can it be a true minister of the beautiful, and a true interpreter of the Divine.

Should the common question of debate, as to whether Art is more beautiful than Nature, here present itself; I would answer, under one view it is, but under another view it is not. A statue conceived by genius and skillfully chiseled out of marble, considered merely as to its contour, may be more perfect and beautiful than any similar living form; but, when both are viewed in their entirety, the living will necessarily surpass the inanimate, because of the presence of the higher element of life which the artist cannot give to his marble. In the mere matter of form, however, with reference to which the sculptor alone can exercise his skill, the statue should glorify nature, and if it fail to do this it is no true work of art.

In its object all art is the same. It is always what it is, only because it seeks to give a true form, a perfect expression, to what has been variously designated as the idea, the spirit, the soul, the invisible, the infinite, the divine. But as beauty though essentially harmony in all cases, is yet present in objects in varying degrees; so also may the different kinds of art be said to be lower or higher, according to the less or more complex qualities which enter into them. Thus of the five arts generally recognized as fine arts, architecture, no doubt, occu-

pies the lowest place. From the fact that it does not find its whole significance in itself, its right to be classed among the fine arts at all, has been questioned, though the æsthetic feeling which its finer and grander structures invariably awaken in the mind of man, I believe, fully entitles it to a place among them. Next to architecture comes sculpture with its cold but highly attractive beauty of form, in which every thing is fixed with such perfect precision, that, like architecture, it might not unaptly be described as *frozen music*. After this is to be placed painting, in which the warmth of color is added to the cold loveliness of graceful outline, so as to make it more life-like and expressive. Then comes music, which with its manifold harmonies awakens all our emotions, penetrates the deepest recesses of the heart, and sends a thrill of pleasurable sadness or of ecstatic joy through our whole being. Lastly, we have poetry, the queen of the fine arts, which, as Cousin admirably says, "constructs according to its own taste, palaces and temples, . . . has the depth and brilliancy of musical notes, . . . speaks to the mind as well as to the heart, . . . and embraces all extremes and all contrarieties in a harmony that redoubles their reciprocal effect, in which, by turns, appear and are developed, all images, all sentiments, all ideas, all the human faculties, all the inmost recesses of the soul, all the forms of things, all real and all intelligible worlds!" In poetry itself we may again distinguish gradations from the simple lyric to the touching ballad, the heroic epic, and the more complex and comprehensive drama in which the varied scenes of human life, with its trials and its troubles, its wisdom and its folly, its joys and its sorrows, are made to pass before us in orderly procession. Beyond this, art has not yet advanced, and probably never will advance, unless we reckon as belonging to its sphere the unwritten drama of actual holy living, the first act of which began in the manger of Bethlehem and ended in the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension; and the last act of which will begin with the final judgment, and end with the beatific vision and the songs of the redeemed.

But though art may never assume any new form, yet as

beauty is more fully apprehended as human intelligence and culture advance, we are compelled to conclude, that art too must assume a higher and more perfect character as the ages move onward toward the final consummation of all things. To hold that in the distant past it reached its highest development, would be to relegate it to the lower stages of human progress, and make it the inferior of philosophy and science. But this would be contrary to our conception of beauty as the end of the ways of God. This, as well as the now generally accepted law of evolution, requires that the higher forms should be the later. And with this view, the history of art is in fullest accord. The oldest art is unquestionably architecture. "The earliest monuments in the world," says Lübke, "are the Pyramids of Memphis. They rise aloft like gigantic landmarks of history, memorials of an age which reaches back into an almost fabulous antiquity." Then came sculpture which also can be traced back to a far-distant and hoary past among the Egyptians, and which attained to marvellous perfection among the Greeks. Painting followed at a very early age, but reached its highest development, only in the times of Michael Angelo and Raphael. As for music and poetry, both these, like the other fine arts, had their origin in the beginnings of human history; but it is only in modern times that they have reached their greatest perfection. This I presume no one will feel prompted to deny as regards music, which, in some respects, may be said to be a creation almost of our own age. But it will be probably disputed that the poetry of modern times is equal, and, much more, that it is superior to that of the ancient Hebrews and Greeks and Romans. Yet if it be the true mission of art to interpret God to man, and if truth and goodness and freedom are essentials of the highest harmony and constituent elements of beauty, then I feel persuaded that we must rank the poetry of Dante and Milton higher than that of Homer and Æschylus. Macaulay is, no doubt, correct in saying, that Homer "sets his images in so clear a light, that it is impossible to be blind to them," while "the works of Milton cannot be comprehended or

enjoyed unless the mind of the reader co-operate with that of the writer;" but he is also right in saying of the thoughts of Milton, that they "resemble those celestial fruits and flowers which the Virgin Martyr of Massinger sent down from the gardens of Paradise to the earth, distinguished from the productions of other soils, not only by their superior bloom and sweetness, but by their miraculous efficacy to invigorate and to heal." Then as regards dramatic poetry, the highest form of the art, does not the crown by universal consent belong to Shakespeare, of whom it has been said by a generally accepted authority, that "it was left for him to extend the empire of the drama over limits not yet recognised, and invest it with a splendor which the world had never seen before."

In art, indeed, as in every other respect, the world has moved onward and upward since the days of Pericles and Æschylus and Phidias. In no particular do the Christian nations of to-day stand on as low a plain as that occupied by the most enlightened nations of antiquity. Our architecture, as a whole, is superior to what theirs was. There is more to call forth true worship in our Gothic cathedrals than there was in the temples of their gods. Our sculpture and painting, if not as perfect in mere outward form, are, nevertheless, the expression of sublimer thought. The statues of the Christ and His saints, and the paintings of scenes in His life and in theirs, are more ennobling and elevating than the statue of the Apollo Belvidere and the painting of Aphrodite by Apelles. And so the works of our poets, though their rhythm may not be always as perfect, and their diction as appropriate as that of Sophocles and Pindar, are yet filled with a higher and holier thought. Nor is it to be wondered at that such is the case, for the ancients found their deepest inspiration in nature, while we find ours in that higher spiritual world revealed unto us by the Christ. Yet not all our Art, by any means, is superior to theirs. For there is much of ours, alas, which draws its inspiration from even a lower source than the mere nature-worship of the Greeks.

But notwithstanding the progress that has been made in art since the dawn of Christianity, it may yet seem to some that the tendencies of our own times are not favorable to its further development, inasmuch as they are predominantly scientific and practical. To such I would say, in the language of Lotze: "Undoubtedly there is beauty even in this, and we may rejoice heartily in that genius of modern times, which, no longer wearing antique draperies, or dreaming through life with flowing hair, goes with shorn locks and close-fitting garments; and we may hope that it will raise from this small germ a mighty tree, filling life with fresh beauty." For the true is never an enemy to the beautiful, but ever one of its best friends and promoters.

Another question, however, may here arise, which also deserves our attention. Why, it may be asked, should we encourage the further development of Art, or even desire it? or in other words, What benefit is Art to humanity?

Plato, in his ideal republic, as is well known, could find no place for soft and enfeebling strains; for statues that could suggest one single feeling of impurity; or for poems that represented any deeds of Deities unworthy of the Divine nature. Even Homer and Hesiod, he holds, are much to blame because they not only tell lies but bad lies; stories about Uranus and Saturn which are immoral as well as false, and which should never be spoken of to young persons, or indeed at all.

Speaking of the Greeks, Frederick W. Robertson, also, very truly and forcibly says: "There is a peculiar danger in refinement of sensuous enjoyments. Coarse pleasures disgust, and pass for what they are; but who does not know that the real danger and triumph of voluptuousness are when it approaches the soul veiled under the drapery of elegance? . . . Refinement, melting imagery, color, music, architecture—all these, even colored with the hues of religion, producing feelings either religious or quasi-religious, may yet do the world's work. For all attempts to impress the heart through the senses, 'to make perfect through the flesh,' are fraught with that danger beneath

which Greece sunk. There is a self-deception in those feelings. The thrill and the sense of mystery, and the luxury of contemplation, and the impressions on the senses—all these lie very close to voluptuousness, enfeeblement of heart—yea, even impurity."

"This, too," he further adds, "is the ruinous effect of an education of accomplishments. The education of the taste and the cultivation of the feelings in undue proportion destroys the masculine tone of mind. An education chiefly romantic or poetical, not balanced by hard practical life, is simply the ruin of the soul."

But though in all this there is truth—important truth—which may well claim our serious attention, and though it is still further true, as Herbert Spencer maintains, that "the activities we call play are united with the æsthetic activities, by the trait that neither subserve, in any direct way, the processes conducive to life," and that therefore æsthetic enjoyment is to the serious business of life what play is to work, a view also held by Plato, yet art is not without real value and use, which the abuse of it ought not cause us to depreciate or ignore.

The mission of Art, as has already been several times stated, is to minister to man's innate love of the beautiful. This love has been implanted in him by his Creator, and is an essential element of his being. To gratify it properly can, therefore, never be wrong, but on the contrary, must always be commendable. It is, indeed, necessary to the complete and harmonious development of his life. For as the body must suffer and sustain injury if its appetites and other requirements be not properly satisfied, so is it also as regards the soul. It is our duty to sow and to reap that our physical needs may be supplied, and for the same reason it is our duty likewise to engage in such other pursuits as the supply of our higher nature requires. In the fact alone, therefore, that we have been endowed with the capacity for enjoying its productions, Art may be said to have its full justification.

But other benefits, besides that of satisfying a real want of our nature, accrue to us through Art. It naturally tends to increase our love of the beautiful, and this love often proves a powerful auxiliary of virtue, "by engaging," as Dr. Bascom truly says, "the faculties in an ennobling form of activity, thus at once preoccupying the ground against vicious inclinations, and bringing the mind nearer to the yet higher intuitions and enjoyments of right action. In the contest between the spiritual and physical, which is waged in every man's nature, beauty arrays itself on the side of the former, and may often furnish that intellectual enjoyment by which the mind is first brought within the calmer, more profound and abiding pleasures which belong to the strictly rational intuitions."

Another and still greater benefit conferred upon us by true Art, is, that it interprets God to us. Like the true and the good, the beautiful, therefore, directly tends to raise us above the merely finite and temporal, and to ennoble us by bringing us into communion with the infinite and eternal. How it does this is so admirably stated by Cousin, that, with his words, I shall close this paper. "God," says this eminent philosopher, "manifests Himself to us by the idea of the true, by the idea of the good, by the idea of the beautiful. Each one of them leads to God, because it comes from Him. True beauty is ideal beauty, and ideal beauty is a reflection of the infinite. So, independently of all official alliance with religion and morals, Art is by itself essentially religious and moral; for, far from wanting its own law, its own genius, it everywhere expresses in its works eternal beauty. Bound on all sides to matter by inflexible laws, working upon inanimate stone, upon uncertain and fugitive sounds, upon words of limited and finite signification, Art communicates to them, with the precise form that is addressed to such or such a sense, a mysterious character that is addressed to the imagination and the soul, takes them away from reality, and bears them sweetly or violently into unknown regions. Every work of Art, whatever may be its form, small or great, figured, sung, or uttered—every work of Art, truly

beautiful and sublime, throws the soul into a gentle or severe reverie that elevates it towards the infinite. The infinite is the common limit after which the soul aspires upon the wings of imagination as well as reason, by the route of the sublime and the beautiful, as well as by that of the true and the good. The emotion that the beautiful produces turns the soul from this world; it is the beneficent emotion that Art produces for humanity."

VIII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER III.—*Concluded.*

A PRECIOUS STONE.

"Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."—St. Matthew xvi. 17.

SECTION IV.

The Rejection of the Holy Ghost.

SINCE they believed not "the writings of Moses," and refused "the baptism of John," what was left for them but to condemn the Son and reject the Spirit of God? With all their reasoning it never occurred to these Jews that they might be benefited by accepting baptism as a test of obedience, if nothing more; that as disobedience was the first fault of erring man, so obedience might be the first virtue required by God of returning man. Had they merely submitted to the baptism of water as an ordinance from heaven, they would have been able to receive their Messiah whom John declared it was to make manifest to Israel. But they not only rejected Jesus, and John and Moses. They discarded their much-vaunted "father Abraham." By that they lost what God's covenant with him was intended to bring about—deliverance from the old sinful life of the first Adam, the law of Moses to be written in their hearts, the renewing of the Spirit that David prayed for, awakening to their lost condition as sinners by nature, and the conviction and acceptance of

their Messiah as a Saviour. They cast off Abraham himself by putting to death his promised Seed in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed!

In betraying and murdering the Christ they were "to fill up the measure of their fathers." But that measure they were to exceed by the wilful rejection of the Holy Ghost, as He proceeded from the Father, and from the Son incarnate in Jesus while He was yet *unsacrificed*. God was drawing very near to the Jewish people. His Son had been sent to fulfil all His gracious promises from the beginning. His Spirit was striving to make them respond to the testimony of their Messiah, which they had not misunderstood. In spite of this they were rejecting even Him; and in so doing were destroying themselves as individuals and a nation; for the Holy Ghost, as He was in Christ just before His life was actually laid down, is next to the last and highest revelation of God to man under the old dispensation. There is but one higher—as He comes from Him characterized by His actual death. That rejected, there would be no hope for them; unless Christ should come again from the dead. But this, His resurrection, is the beginning of the new dispensation. Truly, in wickedness they surpassed their fathers! For though these did "always resist the Holy Ghost," it was the Spirit of the old covenant, who came from the Father, and from the Son *unincarnate*, and not, as then, embodied in the living Jesus. And as they began this sin by stifling their convictions and denying the Christ, so they crowned it by calling Him who dwelt in Jesus and was the author of all His wisdom and mighty works, "the Prince of the devils"—Him, who in the first creation, "moved" or "*brooded*" "upon the face of the waters," at the baptism of Christ was symbolized by the gentle dove, and in the triune life of man is imaged by the guileless little child! For without the woman and the child, perfect or *representative* man is not complete. Man reflects the Father, woman the Son, and the child the Holy Ghost. Of all the race, only two men could stand out, solitary and alone, as the

representatives of its life whole and entire. These were the first Adam and the last Adam, its Father and its Son, the one in whom it was begun, and the one in whom it is finished.

SECTION V.

The Weakness of the First Covenant.

At these last acts of impiety the anger of God, which had burned at the murder of every prophet "from Abel to Zacharias," threatened to destroy the whole Jewish people, when the Son of David with true, royal devotion threw Himself into the breach. Then on Him, the representative of the nation and the church, God poured out the fury of His anger and the fierceness of His wrath; while to the guilty He granted the respite of almost fifty years, if so be they might, as a people, by a retrospective faith be brought to repentance and salvation. But the preaching of the apostles availed no more than that of the prophets. They still refused to believe though One had risen from the dead; and then, lest His house should be defiled by the heathen who were approaching, God moved the Roman general to overthrow the devoted city, and raze to the ground the temple, which once the symbol of a church and a religion, was now to become only a mockery and empty name. The rebels who had doomed to death their High Priest and King, He scattered, never again to become a recognized power till the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled, nor to see their Messiah till He should come as the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, and they be able to say: "Blessed" (and not cursed) "is He that cometh in the Name of the LORD,"* or, which is its equivalent, in the name of Jehovah. Since Christ claimed to be such, the word "*in*" must here bear the force of *wearing*. He comes not as a delegate sent from God with a message, like the Baptist. He comes wearing the name, and with the authority of, because He *is* Jehovah. Heaven and earth are the attire of "God;" but the only gar-

* So written, with small capitals, in Psalm cxviii. 26, from whence it is quoted.

ment by which "the LORD God" can be seen, is the person of the "Son of Man," who "came forth* from God, and went to God;" and who, as such Son of Man (Jehovah) will, and is even now coming "again."

Thus was abrogated (because fulfilled and finished) the imperfect First covenant. It was condemned and set aside because it could not "make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." That was its weakness. It could not give the guilty conscience peace; and this resulted from its being founded on the sacrifice of *brute* life, which is not the life of man. It lacks self-consciousness, and therefore could not waken man's self-consciousness to the evil within him, nor benefit him in any way except as he held it typical of the life of the Man to come. Those who refused to hold it thus, and persisted in sacrifices which then became unmeaning and insulting, only sank the lower toward the scale of the brute, as their conscience was deadened thereby, or the scale of the devil, as it was hardened. Through the perversion of that which God had intended should, by faith, become to them a savor of life unto life, the whole people as a church and nation had sunk into unbelief and wickedness. The natural result was their own destruction with the condemnation and death of their long-promised and long-expected Messiah.

The great First covenant was abolished through the fulfilment of its symbols in their glorious Antitype. Beginning with the first Adam, and including all the lesser covenants of Abraham, Moses and David, it ended with the last Adam, in whom it was gathered up and concluded. Then its ordinances were cast aside, but not that which constituted their strength—the law given to Moses and the commandment to our first father. These still live in His Son who fulfilled and covered them for His people with "grace and truth." The law and the gospel are married in Jesus, and in heaven the ransomed shall sing "the song of Moses and the Lamb,"—of

* St. John viii. 42; xvi. 27, 28; and xvii. 8.

Moses who showed them their lost condition, and the Lamb who delivered them out of it.

SECTION VI.

The Strength of the Second Covenant.

Their Messiah, on the contrary, who ever refused the unholy and persistent demands of the people to prove His divinity by magical signs, who prayed better than Moses the prayer, "Blot me out of thy book," and who was heard where Moses was denied, in that Moses was made, but He born a Mediator,—their Messiah, who obeyed not His own, but the will of the Father, even to the death of the cross, and on whom for His people's sake God had poured out His wrath,—their Messiah, God allowed to prove His pre-existence as LORD, or equally God and Man (Jehovah) by rising again as Man, and becoming the indestructible corner-stone of His ever living church.

Thus was introduced and established, by the Christ, the perfect Second covenant, which is "able to justify him, who believes, from all things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses." Its strength consists in the fact that it is founded on that original and "very good" (*created*) life of man, which, in the first Adam, was to become, according to his obedience or disobedience, either a permanently happy or unhappy life. The sequel is known. Man disobeyed, and became the victim of sin and death and everlasting misery. But his "very good" original life, of which by a "miracle and mystery" the last Adam was a partaker, was, by His obedience, restored for man to its primary condition. Thus restored, it does, in regeneration, take hold on man's present evil life. Gradually changing the character superinduced upon it by Adam's disobedience, it enables its partaker to reach that state of perfect and blissful immortality (through God's *generation*) for which Adam was destined, but, by the intrigue and malice of Satan, failed to reach.

In no other way than by His death could the Messiah continue to prepare for His people that full and perfect Gift of the Holy Ghost by which alone they could be redeemed, and which, begun in His conception, would only be concluded in His glorification. The life that for the purpose of complete redemption, was to touch man's after his fall, was not only to be the *same* human life of Adam before he sinned. It was to be this same life having sounded all the depths of sin, suffered and died to expiate it, and risen again to triumph over it. It was to be a *redeeming* life. And hence, in order to make it such, the necessity for the sinless Son of Adam to bring His life through all these changes, and then impart it, thus characterized, to His people. Hence, too, the difference in character brings a conflict into the subject of regeneration. And yet, even in spite of this difference and conflict, the new and the old life, because of their essential likeness, are so one when united in the single self-consciousness of the Christian, that, though they dare not be confounded, what is predicated of the one, is sometimes predicated of the other: "What I would, that do I not; but what I hate that do I. Now it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Only by their fruits is it possible to distinguish between the two. And even when the old character and life shall be "swallowed up" of the new, each saint in heaven will continue to sing the song of a sinner redeemed; for, in him, the sinful life was before, and older, than the sinless.

That the Spirit of God cannot work effectually outside of man, the case of those who rejected Him proves. He can indeed enter his heart and regenerate him without his knowledge or consent; but the conversion of the subject can only be brought about by his own will and concurrence. He must obey the strivings of the Spirit, and "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling," since "it is God who worketh in him both to will and to do of His good pleasure." And just here Simon Peter differed from those who rejected the Christ. Whereas, on their part, God's Spirit was met by con-

tinual repelling, on his it was encouraged by constant cherishing; for Peter, though self-righteous, was honest and sincere, and could love and accept his Master, and by the door of faith open his heart to God.

It was as necessary for the whole nation, and indeed for the world, that the Messiah should go away in the flesh, and return in the spirit, as it was for the disciples. That it was most expedient for these is shown by the fact that after all His mediatorial acts had been accomplished, and the Holy Ghost with His perfected gift of Christ's life had come to "abide with them forever," they, who before, had been "fools" in an understanding of "the prophets," and "slow of heart to believe," now showed themselves enlightened and quickened with knowledge and faith irresistible. St. Peter especially, to whom the fulness of the Spirit was given in largest measure—and who had previously so little understood the Lord's death that he could deny Him because of it, and was so unexpectant of His resurrection that "certain women of their company" were sent by the "Master" to tell him of it—then took up and proved the prophecies of His death, resurrection and ascension, with quotations from their own Scriptures which were indisputable. That it was also most effectual in the case of the people, is evident from the conversion of many of those same stiff-necked and unbelieving Jews, on the day of His promised out-pouring. When He glorified the Son of man in heaven, and descended on His sons, He fanned into a flame the quenched and smoking fire of conviction in the hearts of those of the "circumcision," "of whom according to the flesh Christ came;" and they, through their latent baptism of John, realized that Jesus of Nazareth was indeed their Messiah, true man and true God, and themselves most guilty of His death. Whereupon they gladly obeyed the apostle's command to "Repent" and "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," and rejoiced in his assurance that with this they should receive what they once despised—"the Gift of the Holy Ghost."

SECTION VII.

The Necessity and Importance of Simon's Confession.

The greatest Gift of the Holy Ghost, and consequently His full advent, could not be obtained except by all the acts of Christ's life. The latter was bound to bring about His own trial and condemnation to death: for no man could take His life from Him. He alone had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. His trial and sentence were to come from the proper ecclesiastical authorities, and could only be secured, first, by His very plain talks with the Jews, and then by His public acknowledgment, before the Sanhedrin, of His true personality as the Son of man and the Son of God. But preparatory to this, it was necessary that a confession of the same be made to Himself by some, or one of the disciples in the presence of the others. It was not enough that the fact be declared by His enemies in the form of an accusation. It must also be declared by His friends in the form of a tenet or accepted truth. This was to be the dividing line between the Jewish church and the Christian. That "the Stone," "the head of the corner," might be raised and set for the finishing of the Jewish, His enemies were to denounce His twofold claim, in fear and hatred. And that this same Stone might be laid as the rock and foundation of the Christian, His disciples were to declare it in love and adoration.

Besides this, the Messiah could not "go away," by death nor ascension, till one at least of the chosen twelve had made the grand confession of His eternal divinity. To him, who did so, was to be entrusted the formal opening of His visible church. Into whose hands indeed could He give, at His departure, "the keys" of "this Kingdom of heaven," if he, who had been called of God, did not openly and unmistakably acknowledge the great truth which had been revealed to him for the very purpose of confessing it? Further still, He could not begin to acquaint His disciples with the momentous facts which were

to follow this confession, till after it had been made. There was much depending on it. It was to open the way for these things to be revealed, and then to take place. And therefore, after Simon had spoken, He tells them for the first time, and to Peter's unbounded surprise, that He—"the Christ" and "the Son of the living God"—must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests and scribes; and be *killed*, and be raised again the third day!"

As God foresaw when He chose Him, the Holy Spirit had not been given to the Son of Jonas in vain. He received His teaching in the love of it. Uninfluenced by worldly or prudential motives, he thought not, like the scribes and Pharisees, to smother the truth. Nor, like Joseph and Nicodemus, did he hide it in his own heart; or, like Saul of Tarsus, afterwards, resist it as an unwelcome conviction. Far from it! For when, as they were come into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus asked the twelve, "Whom say ye that I am?" the childlike and impulsive son and disciple, true to his names of Cephas and Peter, with all the energy of his nature, immediately answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona:" for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven," his Messiah as quickly responded. "Blessed," in having surrendered himself to this teaching and yielded to this conviction; "blessed," in having allowed God to speak through him, and so fulfilling the great design of his being; and "blessed," in having been taught at the will of the Father, and by the Spirit as He is in the incarnate Son; for to have been thus taught, proved him to be born a new man, such as, though he might fall, could never be lost. Thrice blessed Simon!

"The Son of the living God," or, the Son of Jehovah! That which had been hidden from the wise and prudent, lest they, fearful and unbelieving, should bury it forever, was revealed to the simple-hearted fisherman for the very reason that God

knew, when pressed by His Son, he, worldly unwise and imprudent, would declare it. In his heart, Simon "believed" the truth, "unto righteousness," but by speaking it aloud, he made "confession" "unto salvation." And, at this time, it was not only unto his own salvation, but that of the whole world. Without this step of his, the way would not have been opened for the Christ to make His confession before the Sanhedrin; and without that, the world would never have had its Saviour, for only by confession before the high priest, could Jesus compass His vicarious death.

The words, such as "never man spake," and the works, such as "no man could do except God were with him," whilst they enkindled the fatal envy and hatred of the Jews, had produced their legitimate effect on His true Israelites; and now the Messiah's whole mind could be turned toward Jerusalem, "the City of the great King," but whose title also ran, "Thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee." The Foundation-stone, which had long been ready, might now be laid, for the next minor one was hewn and cut, and the succeeding ones were in rapid progress. Of the temple which was to rise slowly and silently, a building made without hands, the pure and spotless chief corner-stone, "Christ," had appeared, and beside its neighbor, the precious stone, "Cephas."

"How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us *plainly*," the Jews said to Jesus; and Peter by speaking aloud the conviction cherished in his inmost heart, had now presented the opportunity for the Messiah to tell them "plainly," and therefore to *die*. Hence Jesus instantly blessed him, and promised him, besides, a particular and personal reward—"And I will give unto *thee* the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." "Unto *thee*," and not unto *you*, the Messiah said. Consequently the promise here cannot be understood as designed for all of the apostles. It doubtless

refers to the closing of the Jewish, and opening of the Christian dispensation on the day of Pentecost; and was fulfilled in Peter's special activity at that time. On another occasion Simon confessed in the name of the twelve,—“*We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God,*” or, “the Holy One of God,” which is without doubt the true version. This confession was made in Capernaum when, under the figure, “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,” Christ had been declaring the truth that men in order to be saved must partake of His whole life, human as well as divine, and the disciples (outside of the twelve) murmuring, had said, “This is a hard saying; who can hear it?” and “from that time many of them went back, and walked no more with him.” “Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Would ye also go away? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God.”* It was an acknowledgment that His words were to be taken in a spiritual sense, for the Jews, looking no farther than His material body, had taken them literally, and “strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His *flesh* to eat?” But it was also a confession, though of His spotless humanity; and being, as such, purely Jewish, Peter by the use of the plural “We,” could make it in the name of all the apostles; and it was valuable because it showed that through their faith in Him as “the Holy One of God,” they could receive, though darkly, the “hard saying” at which the lesser disciples stumbled.

The full and perfect confession, on the contrary, embracing His eternal divinity also, which was made in Cæsarea Philippi was wholly unique and Christian. There the Master's words, “thee” and “thou,” by limiting the blessing and reward to Peter, showed that it was Simon's very own. It was certainly not, at that time (a year *before* His death), the confession of

* R. V. St. John, vi. 69.

Thomas (and perhaps of others), for not until Thomas had seen the Messiah *after* His death and resurrection, could he exclaim with perfect truth and accuracy, "My Lord, and my God!" The *resurrection* of Jesus was probably not the only thing that this doubting disciple had to be convinced of. Had *that* been all, he would, when he saw Him, most likely have made an exclamation of rapture like the Magdalene's "Rabboni!" whereas his words are a fervent confession; for Thomas, too, was to be a representative Christian. His slowness to believe that the Master had risen *may* have been produced by a previous difficulty to believe in His highest divinity; for, with the Jews, it was one thing to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and quite another to believe that the Messiah was God: and it was still another and harder thing to believe that He was highest God, or "one" with "the Father." Faith in *this* would have made all things possible to Thomas, even the news, second hand, of His resurrection. But, though assured by many, "We have seen the Lord" (or Master), he protested, "Except I shall see in his hands the prints of the nails, and put my finger into the prints of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." This was not the language of one who had believed and confessed that Jesus was God. Had his faith begun and kept pace with Peter's and John's, he would have kept in their company (as he afterwards did) and run, like them, to the sepulchre at the very first news of His resurrection. Instead, he wandered alone, silent and sad. And yet Thomas was the man, who—when their Lord, to waken Lazarus, spoke of going into Judea where the Jews had lately sought to stone Him—said to his brethren, "Let us also go, that we may die with him!" Like the women-disciples, he was devoted to Christ, and loved Him more as man than God. But, while they found solace in hovering around His tomb, he hid his grief, and mourned apart. Indeed, how could all the followers of Jesus help loving Him more as man than God, when His Divine nature was yet in abeyance! However, at the time of Thomas' doubting

both Christ's natures had been attested by His resurrection, and as he could not be ordained an apostle without believing and confessing both, Jesus gave him the opportunity of declaring in presence of Himself and "brethren" His human nature by the words, "*My Lord*," and His divine nature by the words, "*My God*."

The confession of Simon Bar-Jona was not premeditated. It had not been agreed upon between him and his fellows. They had no thought that their Master would question them concerning the quality of their faith, nor so suddenly. Jesus intended the answer should be spontaneous. And it was Peter's answer, and Peter's confession. It was, as might be expected of him, wholly objective—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!" While speaking, Simon had no thought of himself, nor of others. It was also adoring. He was lifted above himself, enraptured by the beauty of the Christ. And the response of Jesus was just as ecstatic—"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven!" The confession of Thomas, on the contrary, though made so much later, and under such happier auspices, differed from Peter's in all these respects. It was earnest, but it was entirely subjective, and also wholly self-appropriating—"My Lord, and *my God*." This, however, was but right and natural, for none but Thomas had expressed doubt of the resurrection, and he alone was to be convicted and convinced. He had declared his unbelief publicly and emphatically, and in the same manner he was to retract it. And yet when the retraction did come, through his tardy confession, this was meagre compared with Simon's, for the words of Thomas, "*My God*," fall far below Peter's words, the Son of the *living God*" (Jehovah). The spirit of Christ's answer, so different from the spirit of his reply to Peter, proves it: "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." The message of the women, and His empty grave had been enough to con-

vince Peter and John that the Lord was risen; and though many more of the disciples, gathered together on the evening of His resurrection, "wondered, and believed not," when He appeared among them, their doubt was momentary and occasioned by "joy." It was too blessed to believe.

Simon Bar-Jona's confession of the eternal divinity of Christ, cannot be counted that of his brother-apostles, and made in their name, any more than his denial can be counted theirs, and made in their name. It was no more theirs, and made by him as their spokesman, than his twice suffering for this truth afterward—first in denying it, and then in dying for it—was their suffering, and endured in their name. John, without doubt, believed as much, and more, for he was both meditative and speculative, and could "outrun Peter;" but John did not speak. His work was yet in the future; and his thoughts were away beyond, intent on the eternal humanity of the Christ, which, toward the close of his life, he declared in his gospel by the mystical sentence—"And the Word became flesh." Observe—He became "*flesh*," not "man," only. St. John does not say that the Word, or God the Son, became "*man*." That He always was, in "*essence increate*;" otherwise it would have been no lasting incarnation, but merely a temporary possession. On the contrary, John declares that He (who was already Man essentially) became "*flesh*," or *created* and *mortal* "man," "for us men and for our salvation." In that brief, sublime sentence, the beloved disciple expressed the difference and union of Christ's natures, the similarity and indivisibility of His essences, and the oneness and perpetuity of the incarnation.

"When they came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi," and Jesus asked His disciples, in a body, "Whom say ye that I am?" the majority of them may have been verging to the same belief and confession with St. Peter; but they, like John, were all silent. Simon Bar-Jona spake—he only—boldly, clearly and promptly, and on him alone (as the Prophet predicted in naming him for it at sight) the blessing fell; because

at this stage of their discipleship the Master desired far more than *private faith*. Circumstances demanded *public confession*. A crisis in His ministry had come that required more than *believers* (whether few or many) in His eternal divinity. He needed *confessors* of it also. One at least of the twelve must now avow it frankly and openly, or there would be a check in His progress; and "Simon, surnamed Peter," proved to be that one absolutely necessary confessor. In this way the great doctrine of Christ's perfect Divinity was "established," "at the mouth of two witnesses," of his who spake it, and of His who sanctioned the words and their speaker. It remained for the Master, "from that time forth," to manifest and prove it. And the same words and works, even to His resurrection and ascension, that would show Him, Jesus of Nazareth, to be their true Messiah, were likewise to show that their true Messiah was, from all eternity, God with "the Highest."

SECTION VIII.

The Secret of the Ages.

"The Son of the living God!" "Flesh and blood" had not revealed it to Simon, for flesh and blood knew it not. It was "the mystery" (or secret) that had been "hid from ages and from generations," "which none of the princes of this world knew, for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory;" and it was but now begun "to be made manifest to His saints." That the Messiah, the promised "Seed of the woman," should also be the LORD incarnate, had been hidden from the Jewish Church. God had ordained it for the glory of the Christian. Consequently "the riches of this glory"—the generation of His Divine in connection with His human life, and all the grand results thereof—had also been hidden. And so, too, had the fact been concealed that this regeneration, or "Christ *in* you the hope of glory," should not only "be made known," but boldly offered "among the Gentiles." As the beginning of this secret (Christ's life *twofold*) had

been revealed to Simon Bar-Jona first of all men, so Simon was the first subject of it, as his words proved, for only like can recognize like. This revealing was indeed for his own salvation; but primarily it was that he, the out-spoken, might confess Christ's one twofold life. And since he was to be thus distinguished is it surprising that he alone was personally named for and appointed to offer it to all men publicly, on the day of Pentecost, in the words, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost?" "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Therefore the primacy above all men, which was given to Simon Peter, and can never be taken from him, is this: He was the first to whom God revealed (by conviction through begetting) the eternal and incarnate divinity of the Messiah; the first He called upon to confess it; and the only one He ordained to open formally, and to the whole world, the visible Christian Church. For, said their Messiah, when Peter showed his birth by his confession, "I will give unto *thee* the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever *thou* shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This promise was literally fulfilled when St. Peter, carried away by the irresistible spirit of the new dispensation—which is for "all nations" and "every creature"—closed the exclusively Jewish and opened the universal Christian church by offering, not only to the Jews, but to the Gentiles, all the privileges of the gospel, in the comprehensive words, "For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." After this closing and opening the government and jurisdiction passed equally into the hands of all the apostles, and their successors, according to Christ's secondary promise, "Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Though twelve apostles were called, to only one was it given to speak the words that should make but one, in this respect, immortal. The son of Jonas was elected; and since God uses "the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," and "the weak things of the world to confound the mighty," the election, as far he was concerned, was no doubt based on his gifts of receptivity, frankness and impulsiveness; gifts that are good and natural and not uncommon, but which were surely given to him, at his creation of the first Adam, for this definite purpose. Like Isaiah and Jeremiah and John the Baptist, he may have been, before he was born, "ordained a prophet unto the nations." But he was not chosen for his "mature knowledge," since this was the result, and not the cause of his election. The other apostles were, possibly, as mature as he, though in different directions. He was only advanced in this one (a superior conception of Christ's personality) and that was for a particular purpose. And having been chosen and taught, he proved, as God knew he would, obedient to the heavenly impulse. Very different from Jonah who fled, and Isaiah who faltered, and Moses who demurred, he uttered frankly and fearlessly the conviction, which he afterward sealed with his blood, when Jesus the Master had set him the example of keeping his faith at the price of his life. While eleven were silent, Simon Bar-Jona spake; and of all the twelve, elect, foundation-stones, hewn in darkness and fashioned in secret, the words—"The Son of the living God"—revealed as with a flash the one most precious.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa. With an Introduction by Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th Street, near Broadway. 1891. Price, \$3.00.

The publication of this work is an event in the Reformed Church. During the last half century the Reformed Church has been developing a theology consonant with the spirit and genius of her life and confession. In order to justify its separate existence as a denomination, it was felt that this Church should be able to present a phase of Christian truth peculiarly its own. Having one of the oldest of the Reformation Confessions, and the most œcumenical of them all, the effort has been to produce a theology commensurate with the spirit of this Confession. The work of developing this theology began under the earlier professors in her Theological Seminary, Drs. Rauch, Nevin and Schaff, and was carried forward on the foundation then laid by their successors. The leading principle adopted was that brought out by the leading German theologians since the time of Schleiermacher, the principle that makes the living person of Christ the centre and norm, as well as the source of Christianity. Christianity is essentially and fundamentally, not merely doctrine, nor law, but life. It is founded on *truth*, but if we ask what truth is, Christ Himself furnishes the answer, *I am the Truth*. Truth, therefore, is personal. Dr. Patton defines truth as the agreement of the statement with the objective fact. But this definition makes truth a mere abstraction. Truth is objective, it is an objective reality, it is living. When, therefore, the author of this work takes the Christological principle as central and normative in theology, he takes the truest and best course in developing his system. This principle is coming more and more to rule in our later theology, and its adoption will work for the unification of all evangelical churches. While the author finds the ultimate source of revealed truth in the living person of Christ, he nevertheless makes room for the inspired Scriptures, the written word, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. He also gives Christian consciousness its proper place in the development of truth in the Church. Thus the two Protestant principles, the Word of God and

Justification by Faith, find their union in the person of Christ. The written word is the utterance of the Incarnate Word, and the consciousness of the truth comes from the glorified Christ, through the written word by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Our notice of this work is necessarily brief. In a general way its leading principles are so well known in our Reformed Church, that for the readers of this REVIEW, a lengthy notice is scarcely necessary, but in the theological world in this country and outside of our Church, it presents a new standpoint. It will be welcomed, therefore, we think, as a new and vigorous contribution to theological science. And in this view its publication comes at a propitious time. Views of theology, of Scripture, of Confessions, are undergoing changes. The age seems to be ripe for an advance movement in the theological world. May not the Christological principle adopted in this work aid in solving some of the new problems that are agitating the Churches?

To do this work proper justice would require an article. Our present purpose is merely to express our great satisfaction with its contents, and to commend it to the reading public, not only in our own, but also in other churches.

THE PSALMS. A new Translation with Introductory Essay and Notes. By John DeWitt, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Senior Biblical Professor in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., and a Member of the Old Testament Revision Company. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1891. Price, \$2.00.

We can unhesitatingly commend this volume to our readers, as a work of unusual merit. The new translation of the Psalms which it presents, is a most admirable one on account of its faithfulness to the original, and its superior metrical qualities. It adds new beauty for the English reader to the praise songs of Israel and so increases their attractiveness and power. The introductory essay is a valuable one, and the notes which preface and explain the different psalms, though brief, are all very scholarly and instructive. The book ought to find a place in the library of every Christian family.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London; Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," etc., etc. Vol. XIV. Ecclesiastes—The Song of Solomon—Isaiah, xxvi. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1891. Price \$1.50.

These discourses are possessed of the same brilliant qualities that characterize those of the preceding volumes of the series. They are not critical dissertations, but practical expositions of the important truths of that portion of Scripture to which they relate. They cannot be read without profit, and will be sure to promote "high thought and holy living." Those of our readers who have the earlier volumes of the work will of course desire this volume also.

THE GENERAL EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE. By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham; formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, \$1.60.

This volume belongs to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," and is a work of decided merit. It is divided into thirty-eight chapters. Of these the first is introductory, and treats of the Catholic Epistles. Of the remaining thirty-seven chapters, twenty-eight are devoted to the Epistle of St. James, and nine to that of St. Jude. Besides the contents of the Epistles, their authenticity, authorship and relations to other Scriptures and Apocryphal writings are ably discussed. Dr. Plummer is disposed to believe that St. James and St. Jude were real brothers of our blessed Lord. The exposition of both Epistles is scholarly and instructive. The volume will be found a truly valuable addition to the series of which it forms a part.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS. By R. F. Horton, M.A., Hampstead; late Fellow of New College, Oxford. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th Street, near Broadway. 1891. Price, \$1.50.

This volume belongs to the same series as the one just noticed. In it the teachings of the Book of Proverbs are considered. First in a brief introductory section the general character of this portion of God's Word is described. Then in thirty-one expository lectures, or practical sermons, the author treats the book as a uniform composition, following chapter by chapter the order which its compiler adopted, and bringing the scattered sentences together under subjects which are suggested by certain more striking points in the successive chapters. In this way he has succeeded in reviewing the greater part of the contents of the book. The subjects accordingly discussed, it is scarcely necessary to say, are all of the highest importance. Their treatment throughout, we would yet add, is highly judicious and edifying.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. By the Rev. S. H. Kellogg, D.D., Author of "The Jews; or Prediction and Fulfilment," "The Light of Asia and the Light of the World," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street, near Broadway. 1891. Price, \$1.50.

This is still another volume of the "Expositor's Bible." Leviticus, the contents of which it aims to expound, is not a very attractive book to the ordinary reader of the Sacred Scriptures. It is a book, however, which is nevertheless worthy of careful study. To the ancient people of Israel it had a special importance, as setting forth the law that was to govern them, and we therefore need to acquaint ourselves with it, if we would at all understand the significance of the history of this wonderful people. Besides this, it has a value for us as presenting, in a singularly vivid manner, the fundamental con-

ditions of true religion, and as suggesting the principles which should guide human legislators who would rule according to the mind of God. Moreover, it is of use to us also as embodying in type and figure, prophecies of things yet to come, pertaining to Messiah's kingdom.

In the introductory chapter of his exposition of the book under consideration, Dr. Kellogg presents strong reasons for the Mosaic origin and the inspired authority of its legislation. This he shows was the view of Christ, and for himself he says "We then stand without fear with Jesus Christ, in our view of the origin and authority of the book of Leviticus." His exposition of the book is thoroughly evangelical in tone, and, at the same time, highly interesting and instructive. We heartily commend the volume as a work that is worth possessing, and that will amply repay careful reading.

MY JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM. Including Travels in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Belgium, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Palestine and Egypt. By Rev. Nathan Hubbell. With 64 illustrations. New York: Printed by Hunt & Eaton, 150 Fifth Avenue. 1890. Price, \$1.00.

Rev. Mr. Hubbell made a trip to Jerusalem in 1889, with the Fall Palestine Party, which was organized by him. In the volume now before us he gives an account of his journey, its sights and significations, with personal impressions and adventures. A large portion of the book was written while travelling and appeared in the form of foreign letters in the *Daily Journal and Courier* of New Haven, Conn. Though there is nothing specially new in the book, it is nevertheless quite readable and admirably suited for a place in the family and Sunday-school library. It has all the interest of the ordinary Sunday school story book, and will prove far more instructive and profitable.

SKETCHES OF JEWISH LIFE IN THE FIRST CENTURY. Nicodemus; or Scenes in the Days of Our Lord. Gamaliel; or Scenes in the Times of Saint Paul. By James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1891. Price, 60 cents.

In the sketches contained in this little volume, Dr. Strong assumes the task of setting in a fresh, but not altogether novel aspect, two well-known characters of sacred story, and to weave around them the principal features of the first era of Christianity. The first relates more especially to our blessed Lord, and the second to St. Paul, as indicated in their titles. Though we cannot praise very highly the artistic qualities of these sketches, we can yet commend them as presenting important facts and truths in an attractive form. The book is admirably adapted to supply a want of proper reading for the young, and ought to find a place in every Sunday-school library.

If young persons generally read more books of this character and less sentimental love stories and foolish adventures it would be a great gain to them.

THE DISEASES OF PERSONALITY. By Th. Ribot, Professor of Comparative and Experimental Psychology at the College of France, and Editor of the "*Revue Philosophique*." Authorized translation. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1891. Price, 75 cents.

In this treatise the diseases of personality are considered with a view of throwing some light on its nature. The book, which is a small volume of 157 pages, is made up principally of four chapters which treat respectively of organic disorders, emotional disorders, the disorders of the intellect, and the dissolution of personality. In an introductory section the object of the treatise is set forth, and in a concluding section, the results attained are presented. "By person," Professor Ribot states, "we generally understand the individual as clearly conscious of itself and acting accordingly." In this he is no doubt correct. But we cannot consent to the conclusion which he reaches, that "consciousness is not an entity, but a sum of states, of which each is a phenomenon of a particular kind, bound up with certain conditions of the activity of the brain, which exists when they exist, is lacking when they are absent, disappears when they disappear;" and that accordingly "the organism and the brain, as its highest representation, constitute the real personality, containing in itself all that we have been, and the possibilities of all that we shall be," so that "the unity of the ego is not that of the one-entity of spiritualists, which is dispersed into multiple phenomena, but the co-ordination of a certain number of incessantly renaissant states, having for their support the vague sense of our bodies." Many interesting facts, however, are brought forward in support of this conclusion.

THE SOUL OF MAN. An Investigation of the Facts of Psychological and Experimental Psychology. By Dr. Paul Carus. With 152 Illustrations and Diagrams. Chicago, Ill.: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1891. Price, \$3.00.

What is the nature of the human soul? This is a problem upon the proper solution of which a great deal depends. It lies at the very centre of philosophy and of ethics. With this problem the volume before us has to do. The principal things of which it treats are, the philosophical problem of mind, the rise of organized life, the physiological facts of brain-activity, the immortality of the race and the data of propagation, the investigations of experimental psychology, and the ethical and religious aspects of soul-life. All these subjects Dr. Carus discusses in a very interesting and thorough manner, from the standpoint of positive monism which at present prevails to so great an extent in philosophy and science.

As regards the work we cannot accept as correct, either the philosophical view that underlies it, or the psychological conclusions arrived at in it. Yet we have found the work, nevertheless, both attractive and instructive on account of the large amount of important facts bearing on the points under discussion, which the author has collected in his book and which can no where else be found so conveniently compiled and presented. The illustrations which are numerous and very fine, add also greatly to the value of this volume.

Concerning the study of psychology to which his book is a contribution, Dr. Carus very truly says:

"It is indispensable for every one who has to deal with people; and who has not? the physician, the clergyman, the employer of labor, the officer in the army, the professor, the merchant, the banker almost every one has to deal with people, and, above all the lawyer. Self-knowledge is not sufficient to make us free; it must be self-knowledge and the knowledge of other people; it must be self-knowledge in the broadest sense, knowledge of the soul, of the motives that work upon, and can be employed to affect man's sentiments. It is only knowledge that can make us free; and knowledge will make us free. And because it makes us free, knowledge, and chiefly so psychological knowledge, is power."

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. Edited by Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson. M. A. Associate Editors: Rev. Talbot Wilson Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York city, and Rev. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1891.

We have space only for a brief notice of this valuable and important work at this time. Its object is "to furnish in a concise form, information upon biblical, archaeological, ecclesiastical and historical topics. Hence the vocabulary has been purposely made very large, and most of the articles very condensed."

An error occurs under the title "Reformed Church," in stating that "in 1836 Marshall College was founded at Lancaster, Pa." It should be "at Mercersburg, Pa."

The work is prepared in the best style, and is worthy a place in every good library.